

The Classical Review

APRIL 1900.

The beginning of a new series of Greek and Latin texts in English claims more than a passing mention; and this fresh proof of the enterprise of the Oxford University Press suggests more than one reflection of interest. In the first place it gives welcome proof of the revival of English Classical scholarship: twenty years ago, we may safely say, such an undertaking would have been destined to collapse, whereas now there is fair prospect of its being brought to a creditable, if not to a distinguished conclusion. But we must not let our patriotic satisfaction carry us so far as to rejoice with some of our contemporaries that now at last have we a national series of classical texts. For new texts, single or serial, of ancient authors the sole *raison d'être* is that they are superior to their predecessors.

Externally, the coming series will maintain the reputation of its domicile; with paper, type and margin, little fault can be found; the size and shape of its pages will commend themselves to many, and the place of its brief critical notes below the text is beyond doubt the most convenient one. Its intrinsic claims to consideration, to which we here advert without prejudice to the judgments which competent critics in this journal or elsewhere will pass upon its individual components, cannot be altogether dissociated from the mode of its origin. Oxford has long prescribed that the books in which its alumni are to be examined shall be studied in certain texts. These safety matches, if we may call them so, for kindling the illumination of learning it now decides shall be made at home. We see no reason why it should not: we do not share trade prejudice that University Presses should publish nothing but what is unremunerative: though we may add that even in this respect the University which is now labouring under the load of the New English Dictionary has done its full share.

But we cannot but feel that the existence of this 'tied' connexion justifies the question why the delegates of the Clarendon Press did not make their

roll of editors more representative of the best English scholarship than it is. It contains, it is true, a good number of names that we associate at once with the authors assigned to them: but others are not there which we should have expected to find, and of these more than one is an Oxford name. In some cases the connexion between the editor and the text is not immediately obvious while others have to be taken entirely upon trust.

As regards the last class we may observe that scholars, like everyone else, must learn their trade; but it should not be at the expense of what are to be authorised texts of corrupt and difficult authors. We wish the series every success; but we cannot repress the apprehension that what might have had even an international value, may prove to have only a domestic one.

The learned editor and the devoted publisher of the Leyden reproductions of classical manuscripts pursue steadily their course of well-doing towards ancient scholarship. Their fifth volume is the *Codex Decurtatus of Plautus*, edited by that distinguished specialist, Professor Zangemeister of Heidelberg. This as well as the other four in the series, Prof. H. Omont's fragments of the *Sarravianus-Colbertinus codex of the LXX.*, Prof. H. Hagen's *Codex Bernensis 363* (containing works of Horace, Ovid, Augustine, Bede, etc.), the Bodleian Plato, edited by Mr. Allen (in 2 vols.), we cordially recommend to the notice of librarians and scholars of means whether in England or America. The price varies from £8 to £11 5s. for the *Plautus*, which is far from excessive considering the interest and costliness of the reproductions. The announcements include the *Medicean Tacitus*, the *Ambrosian Terence*, and the *Venetian A. of the Iliad*. Subscription forms and specimen pages can be obtained from the publisher, Mr. A. W. Sijthoff, of Leyden.

From Canada we learn that the private library of Otto Ribbeck is now catalogued and lodged on the shelves of the University Library of Montreal.

THE ORIGIN OF THE EGYPTIAN YEAR.¹

In a number of ingenious papers which have appeared in *Nature*² it has been sought to demonstrate the connection of the Egyptian year with the heliacal rising of Sirius. Such a connection seems not improbable; but when it is used as an argument for discrediting the precise statements of Censorinus, it seems desirable to sift the matter once more.

As is well known the Egyptian year contained 365 days, and so in every four years receded one day in comparison with a Julian year. Thus in 1461 Julian years the Egyptian year would have circulated entirely through the 4 seasons, and would return to its place. Censorinus tells us (*De die natali*, 18, § 10; 21, §§ 10, 11) that one of these cycles of 1461 years began in the year 139 A.D., and notes that the Egyptian New Year or 1 Thoth was in that year 20 July in the Julian year, and was the date on which the heliacal rising of Sirius took place.

Prof. Lockyer has shown that the orientation of Egyptian temples is intended to enable the priests to observe exactly the day of certain astronomical phenomena; and he suggests that the heliacal rising of Sirius was one of the most important phenomena so observed, and that indeed it determined the year. He argues, however, that the Sothic cycle, or cycle of 1461 years, began in 3192 B.C., 1728 B.C., 270 B.C. 'An inscription of Philae,' he writes, 'described by Brugsch (p. 87), states that when it was written the 1st of Thoth=28th of Epiphi. That is, according to the view we are considering, the heliacal rising of Sirius occurred on the 28th of Epiphi in the vague year. He fixes the date of the inscription between 127 and 117 B.C.' Now, 'as the Sirius-year is longer than the vague one, the first vague year will be completed before the first Sirius-year.' Hence, unless Prof. Lockyer really means that the view he is considering is that the 1st of Thoth in the vague year occurred on the 28th of Epiphi in the Sirius year (not, as he says, the heliacal rising of Sirius occurred on the 28th of

Epiphi in the vague year), there must³ want 148 years to the end of the Sothic cycle (not, as he says, 148 years have elapsed since the cycle ended). In this case 1 Thoth in the vague year=1 Thoth in the Sirius year, between the years 22-32 A.D., if Brugsch's date for the inscription is correct. The inscription dated *circa* 1580 B.C. is not affected by this change; nor yet that of Pepi *circa* 3044. If this is what Prof. Lockyer intends, it can only be said that such a solution cannot be put into any harmonious connection with any other known facts.

Subsequently he proceeds to discuss Censorinus' statement that a Sothic cycle was completed in 139 A.D. He there refers to the Alexandrian reform of the calendar 'in the year 23 A.D.' when 'the first of Thoth would take place on August 29, a very important date.' But the Alexandrian reform took place in 26 B.C., and the first of Thoth was then Aug. 30; in 23 A.D. 1st Thoth must be Aug. 18th if Censorinus is to be believed, and Prof. Lockyer agrees that he ought.

We are thus led to suppose the solutions in *Nature* to be mere nests due to a confusion of 26 B.C. and A.D. and to an erroneous calculation. If so, the assumed discrepancies of the inscriptions with Censorinus' accounts vanish.

Can we then, assuming Censorinus to be right, explain the other datings? Let us begin with some general considerations, that must be accounted for in our calculations.

Oppolzer⁴ showed that the heliacal rising of Sirius was in 1601 B.C. on July 18.6 Julian=July 4 Gregorian, and in 1 B.C. on July 19.7 Julian=July 17 Gregorian. In 139 A.D. we know from Censorinus that it was on July 20 Julian=July 19 Gregorian,

³ There is roughly a change of one day in four years. That Prof. Lockyer has overlooked his own intention will appear if we compare his statement in vol. 46, p. 105 'in relation to the established year the solstice would sweep forward among the days; in relation to the true year the 1st of Thoth would sweep backwards' with the plan he has adopted for his chart of the movement of the heliacal rising through the vague year in reversed order. Under figure 4 we read 'The distribution of the 1st of Thoth (representing the rising of Sirius) among the Egyptian years': and presently by a most unfortunate confusion 'the 1st of Thoth in the vague year.'

⁴ In vol. 47, p. 229 we have 23 B.C. given.

⁵ *Nature*, vol. 46, p. 105.

¹ This article was submitted to the editor of *Nature* for publication, and was declined by him on the ground of 'want of space.'

² The whole of Prof. Lockyer's papers are worth consulting although they are not actually consecutive: vol. 43, p. 559; 44, pp. 8, 57, 107, 199; 45, pp. 296, 373, 487; 46, p. 104; 47, pp. 32, 228.

and
B.C.
Greg
Julia
Si
by
year
retur
year
of a
back
that
2874
Th
risin
Egyp
(150
in g
risin
the
= 14
Th
perio
about
—the
day
1420
be ac
we re
appea
are t
cordi
Sothic
= 36
Heli
the re
1 Th
of the
most c
be nec
them.
Julian.
2 11
46, p.
Young
length
length
over:
years.
2876
3 If
rigorou
401.1
1600
we get
the Sir
small e
the est
mentou
n.c. sh
with, a
in 2876
was Jul
obsole

and we may roughly¹ calculate that in 2901 B.C. it rose on July 17. 7 Julian = June 24 Gregorian, and in 1401 B.C. on July 18. 7 Julian = July 6 Gregorian.

Since the vague Egyptian year was shorter by .242392² of a day than the true solar year, in 1506 years the vague year would return to where it before was in the true year. Hence if 139 A.D. gives the beginning of a cycle which brought the vague year back to its old position in the true year, that cycle began previously in 1368 and 2874 B.C.

The period of time required for the Sirius-rising to return to the same date in the Egyptian vague year would be roughly $(1506 - 13.1 \times 4)$ years if Oppolzer is correct³ in giving the interval between the Sirius risings of 1601 and 1 B.C. correctly. Thus the Sirius period is $1506 - 52.4$ years = 1453.6 years.

Thus if 2874 B.C. begins the first Sothic period—that the first period began hereabouts has been conjectured with plausibility—the Sirius rising would be on the same day of the Egyptian vague year again in 1420 B.C., and again in 34 A.D. It cannot be accident that this is the year in which as we read in Tacitus *Annals* vi. 28, the phoenix appeared in Egypt. According to some, we are told, the bird lived for 500 years; according to others for 1461 years, i.e. for the Sothic period roughly calculated, since $1461 = 365\frac{1}{4} \times 4$. The former birds flew into Heliopolis—the name is to be noticed—in the reigns of Sesostris, Amasis, and Ptolemy,

¹ These figures and the others throughout the rest of the paper, though only approximations, are almost certainly so accurate that no correction that may be necessary will invalidate the reasoning based upon them. In 139 A.D. the exact date would be 20.5 Julian.

² I have left Prof. Lockyer's figures (*Nature*, vol. 46, p. 105), although 365.242193 is given by C. A. Young (*General Astronomy*, pp. 137, 528) as the length of the tropical year. This would make the length of the solstice cycle 1507 years, and a little over: so that two cycles would perhaps cover 3015 years. The first period would begin in 2877 or 2876 B.C.

³ If we use Oppolzer's figures as precise, and work rigorously so that Sirius in 1600 years rises later by $401.1 \frac{1}{1600}$ days than would be given by a 365 day year, we get 1455.9 years, virtually 1456 as the length of the Sirius cycle. In such long periods of time a small error in the calculation of Sirius' rising and in the estimate of the length of the year becomes momentous. It may be suggested that the date 2876 B.C. should be used to correct the Sirius calculations with, and not *vice versa*. It should be noticed that in 2876 B.C. Sirius rose 17.9 Julian, and the solstice was July 17.3. Biot (*Nature*, vol. 46, p. 105) is obsolete.

3rd king of the Macedonian dynasty. Now it is of course possible that we have preserved in our various authorities different beginnings of Sothic periods, in consequence of the date of the Sirius-rising⁴ being different at different places: but it is at any rate worth noticing that this date 34 A.D. may harmonize with the Brugsch inscription, if its date should be really between 117–113⁵ B.C. Again, it is also worth noticing that the period of 500 years = 125×4 is the period in which the Sothic cycle would alter by 4 months and the 5 epagomen days; and there is some trace of the Egyptian year being grouped into periods of 4 months—the other 4 month periods would revolve in 480 years. Three months would take 360 years, and it may be worth pointing out that Tacitus says that as the period from Ptolemy to Tiberius was less than 500 years, some supposed the phoenix of 34 A.D. to have been spurious; while from Ptolemy (247–222) to Censorinus' date for the beginning of the Sothic cycle is 385–360 years—we are not told in which year of Ptolemy's reign the phoenix appeared.

It is reasonable, however, to connect with the appearance of the phoenix in Ptolemy's reign a decree that is preserved to us, and which was published in 238 B.C.—the decree of Canopus or Tanis which puts the heliacal rising of Sirius on 1 Payni. In regard to this decree, we may grant the probability of Prof. Lockyer's suggestion that the calendar was revised, when the vague year had deserted the true year by 4 months, but again we must point out that instead of the cycle beginning as he supposes in $238 + 380 = 618$ B.C.—a date which then requires him to elaborate a conjectural explanation of its origin—the cycle began in roughly $238 - 380$ years = 143 A.D., or to be quite accurate since the Sirius-rising in 238 B.C. would be about July 19.6 Julian = July 15 Gregorian, and about 143 A.D. it is on July 20 Julian = July 19 Gregorian, there is not an interval of $95 \times 4 = 380$ years required to bring the Sirius rising from 1 Payni to 1 Thoth, but only the number of years that will by the difference between them and the Julian year yield 94.6 days. This number is 376 years, and this gives us again Censorinus' date for the beginning of the cycle 139 A.D.

Lastly there are some inscriptions at

⁴ *Nature*, vol. 47, p. 33.

⁵ Or reckoning accurately 113–109 B.C.

⁶ 5 Epacts + 30 Mesori + 30 Epiphi + 30 Payni = 95. And this must have 1 subtracted for the difference between July 19 and 20 Julian.

Edfu,¹ said to have been cut between 117 and 81 B.C.; in them we find the rising of Sirius referred to under 1 Mesori. To calculate roughly this would give the date of these inscriptions as $(30 + 5) \times 4 = 140$ years before either 139 A.D., which is out of the question, or before 34 A.D. This would give the date as 107 B.C. In any case we can see that it is a mistake to turn the cycle the other way, and make it begin 140 years before 117 B.C.

In conclusion it may be well to repeat what Prof. Lockyer has well pointed out, that feasts would be *fixed for some considerable time to a particular day in the vague year*: only at intervals, as the vague year took these dates out of their connexion with the natural phenomena which the feasts celebrated, would the authorities rectify the calendar. Thus there might be at the outside 12 rectifications in each Sothic cycle when the calendar had shifted by a whole month: at intervals, then, of 120 years or so.² This may perhaps explain the difficulty of the same³ date being found constant for

certain feasts in the reigns of Ramses II. and III.—covering a period of 120 years.

T. NICKLIN.

Llandovery.

While this has been passing through the press, I have received from the kindness of Mr. T. G. Pinches, of the British Museum, a note of a paper which he heard read at Rome in October last by Prof. Erman about an Egyptian inscription, a short *précis* of the contents of which appears in bulletin no. 7 of the Orientalist Congress held in that city, p. 20.

The document was found at Kabun, and is now in the Berlin Museum. It consists of two fragments, and the text shows, that in the 7th year of Usertesen III. the Sothis-star rose on the 16th day of the 8th month. From this the author concluded that the 7th year of the king mentioned fell between 1876 and 1872 B.C. This is a rough calculation, allowing 4 years for the change of one day, and would put the beginning of the Sothic period about 1314 B.C. If my arguments are sound, the inscription should be about either $1420 + 558 = 1978$ A.C. or $1368 + 577 = 1945$ B.C. It confirms a conjecture I had made that the Egyptian calendar was readjusted *ten times* in each Sothic cycle—the presence of three diverse inscriptions with the equivalent 28 Epiphi can hardly be fortuitous.

NOTES ON THE SEVENTH BOOK OF THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY (ED. STADTMÜLLER).

11, 3 ἀλλ' ἐτέρων πολλῶν δυνατώτερος (scil. ὁ γλυκὺς Ἡρίννης πόνος).

δυνατώτερος is undoubtedly corrupt. I would read πινυτώτερος (cp. 22, 7). But if δν in A is corrected from λν, as Stadtmüller thinks possible, γλυκερώτερος might be thought of.

17, 1 Αἰολικὸν παρὰ τύμβον ἰὼν, ξένη, μὴ με θανοῦσαν †

τὰν Μιτυληναίαν ἔννεπ' αἰδοσέμεν. μ' ἵποδυσαν seu με χαδεῖν γὰν con. Stadtmüller. Read μὴ ὕδοθεν οὔσαν (which is diplomatically more probable than μὴ μ' ἐνοῦσαν or μὴ μ' ἔτ' ἐνοῦσαν or μὴ μ' ἔθ' ἵποδυσαν, which one might also conjecture).

21, 8 ἀλλ' ὁ περισσὸς αἰὼν ἀθανάτοις δέρεται ἐν σελίσιν. δέρεται, for which various conjectures

have been made, is sound: 'shines.' It illustrates, and is illustrated by, Pindar's δέδορκεν φάος, Nem. iii. 84.

25, 7 μολπῆς δ' οὐ λήγει μελιτερπέος ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἐκείνον

βάριτον οὐδὲ θανὼν εὔνασεν ἐν Ἀἰθρῇ. ἔτι τείνων Stadtm., alii alia. Read ἔτ' ἐκείνους sc. τοῖς νεκροῖς.

26, 6 ὥς ὁ φιλακρήτου σύντροφος ἁρμονίης. Write Ἄρμονίης,

27, 8 ἦδὺ μέθυ βλίσζων, ἀμφίβροχος εἶματα Βάκχῳ,

ἄκρητον θλίβων νέκταρ ἀπὸ †στολίδων. These verses describe Anacreon taking part in a κόμος (cp. v. 2 μῆτ' ἐρατῶν κόμων ἀνδία μῆτε λύρης, which means, not without flute nor lyre), and as the κόμος was sung to flutes we can easily restore

ἄκρητον θλίβων νέκταρ ἀπὸ στομίδων.
στομίς, the mouthpiece of the flute.

34, 3 οὐ μέλος εἰσαΐων φθέγγαιό κεν ὥς ἀπὸ
Μουσῶν

ἐν Καδμου θαλάμοις σμήνος ἀπεπλά-
σατο.

ὥς ποτε Heck. ὥς ρα τὸ Stadtmüller. ῥα is
useless, and ποτε is not wanted. Read φθέγγαιό
κεν 'αὐτὸ τὸ Μουσῶν—σμήνος ἀπεπλάσατο.'
One τὸ fell out, αὐτὸ became ἀπὸ, and the
insertion of ὥς was a natural consequence.

28, 2 ὦ ξένη, τόνδε τάφον τὸν Ἀνακρείοντος
ἀμείβων
σπείσον μοι παριών· εἰμὶ γὰρ οἶνο-
πότης.

Stadtm. suggests that παριών with ἀμείβων
is redundant and offers some conjectures.
But πείρειμι means not only to pass by, but
to come forward or approach. The passing
stranger is asked to approach the tomb:
σπείσον παριών = πάρῃσι καὶ σπείσον.

48, 4 καὶ † πόνος εἰνδίοις τῇδε παρερχομένοις.
(On Euripides). I would read πόθος.

49, 4 τρίς γὰρ ἐπαστράψας, Εὐριπίδῃ, ἐκ Διὸς
αἰθήρ

ἤγγισε τὰν θνατὰν σήματος † ἱστορίαν
σώματος Barnes, alii; σώματι συστροφίαν
Stadtm. Read

σώματος ἁρμονίαν

Cp. 383 6 νεύρων καὶ κώλων ἄρμ; 489 2;
472, 8 ὁστων ἄρμ.

51, 6 σὸν δ' οὐ τοῦτον ἐγὼ τίθεται τάφον ἀλλὰ
τὰ Βάκχου

βήματα καὶ σκηνὰς ἔμβαλε † ἐρειδο-
μένας

Stadtm. gives ἔμπεδ' ἑρ. Many other con-
jectures have been made. Read simply ἔμβολ'
ἐρειδομένας. ἔμβολα = ἐπιστύλια, see Eurip.
Bacch. 591. The words mean 'with firmly
supported beams.'

79, 3a. "Ὁνθρωπ", Ἡράκλειτος ἐγὼ σοφὰ μοῖνος
ἀνευρών

φαμί· τὰ δ' ἐς πάτραν κρέσσονα καὶ
σοφίης.

λὰξ γὰρ καὶ τοκέων † ἀσίῳι, ξένη,
δύσφρονας ἄνδρας

ὑλάκτεν. β. λαμπρὰ θρεψαμένοισι
χάρις.

In attempting to restore the third line of
this notoriously difficult epigram, we have to
choose between two possible views of the
meaning. Either there is a reference to
unfilial conduct on the part of Heraclitus
towards his parents, conduct prompted by
patriotic motives; or there is no such
reference and τοκέων conceals some other
word. In the latter case, it seems
necessary to suppose that the δύσφρονες

ἄνδρες were the whole body of citizens
against whom Heraclitus was in a minority
of one; otherwise there seems to be no point
in θρεψαμένοισι χάρις. We should then have
to read ἀστοὺς for ἀσίῳι, and replace τοκέων
by the participle which λὰξ demands—καὶ
πατέων or καππατέων. Perhaps it is safer to
believe that the Palatine text is correct so
far as it preserves a reference to the parents
of the philosopher. In that case, assuming
λὰξ to be sound, we have in a similar
manner to supply a participle and are
therefore almost driven to read

λὰξ γὰρ καὶ τοκέας πατέων, ξένη, δύσφρονας
ἄνδρας
ὑλάκτεν.

The epigram goes on:

a. οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; β. μὴ τρηχύς. α. ἐπὶ τάχα
καὶ σύ τι πένσῃ
τρηχύτερον πάτρας. β. χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ
'Εφέσου'

πάτρας probably belongs to β. Read
τρηχύτερον. β. πάτρας χαῖρε φύλαξ Ἐφέσου.

97, 3 Οὐ μόνον ἐς Πέρσας ἀνέβη Ξενοφῶν διὰ
Κύρον

ἀλλ' ἀνοδὸν ζήτων ἐς Διὸς ἥτις ἄγοι
παιδείης γὰρ ἐῖς Ἑλληνικὰ πράγματα
δείξας

ὥς καλὸν ἢ σοφὴν μνήσατο Σωκράτεος.

In this epigram of Diogenes, one expects
to find in the corrupt words παιδείης γὰρ ἐῖς
a reference to the Cyropaedeia, so that the
four chief works of Xenophon may be
mentioned. Reiske's π. παρ' ἐῖς in this
sense will not do. I would point out that
the reading of the MSS. ΠΑΙΔΕΙΗΣ
ΓΑΡΕΗΣ suggests another view: namely
that the reference is not to the Cyropaedeia,
but to the work on the Constitution of the
Lacedaemonians. παιδείῃ or παιδείην Σπάρτης
would be diplomatically a simple correction.
If we read παιδείῃ, which seems better, we
take it with ζήτων; while παιδείην would
depend, along with πράγματα (asyndeton),
on δείξας. The objection to this view is
that Diogenes would not have omitted the
Cyropaedeia; but in so condensed an
epigram he might have thought that the
first line would cover the two works relating
to Persia.

114. 4 ἀλλὰ διεψεύσθης, σεσοφισμένε· διὴ γὰρ ὁ
μὲν θῆρ

ἦε δράκων, σὺ δὲ θῆρ, οὐ σοφὸς ὢν
ἔάλως.

ἔ* ἄλωσ C ἔλάλωσ A* ἔάλως D. A contrast
is required to the keen-sighted beast—δράκων.
Read.

σὺ δὲ θῆρ, οὐ σοφὸς ὢν, ἀλάως.

123, 4 οὐκ ἐρέω δ' ὅτι σταντὸν ἐκὼν βάλες ἐς
βόον Αἴτνης
ἀλλὰ λαθεῖν ἐθέλων ἔμπεσες οὐκ
ἐθέλων.

Stadtmüller's ἀλλ' ἀθρεῖν is attractive; but λαθεῖν may possibly be right: wishing it not to be known that you courted death, you fell in as if οὐκ ἐθέλων. I suggest, however, that Diogenes wrote *θανεῖν*, 'though (as a philosopher) willing to die.' The corruption would have easily arisen from a dittogram of λα—ἀλλὰ λαθανεῖν.

132, 2 Καὶ σέ, Πρωταγόρη, σοφείης ἴδμεν βέλος
δέξυ
ἀλλ' οὐ τιτρώσκον <τι πινύσκειν> δὲ
γλυκὺ χρῆμα.

So Stadtmüller. The supplement is quite uncertain; but for χρῆμα P gives κρήμα, and we should read, I think, κνήσμα (or κνίσμα), which is appropriate to βέλος.

200, 3 χεῖρα γὰρ εἰς ἀραιὰν παιδὸς πέσον
(τέττιζέ loquitur).

εἰς νεαρὰν coni. Stadtm., alii alia. Perhaps εἰς λαϊὰν.

220, 4 δάκρυ δ' ἐπισπείσας 'Χαίροις, γύναι' ἐκ
γὰρ ἀκουῆς
οἰκτεῖρω σέ' ἔφην 'ἦν πάρος οὐκ
ιδόμην.

σέ γ' ἔφ Wakefield, σ' ἐφάμην Heck, σε ταφών coni. Stadtm. Read οἰκτεῖρων σ' ἔφ θ η ν ἦν πάρος οὐκ ιδόμην.

The next verse begins:

ἃ πόσον ἡθέων νόον ἦκαχες

I propose:

ἃ πόσον ἡθέους νέον ἦκαχες

233, 4 νοῦσον ὅτ' εἰς ἐπάτην ὠλίσθανε τέρμα
τ' ἄφυκτον
εἶδεν ἀριστεῖν ἐμφανὲς † εἰς ἰδίην.

(On the general Aelius). It is clear that τέρμα depends on εἶδεν, and that there was a verb in the latter half of the pentameter. Stadtmüller's conjecture ἡμφάνισ' (perhaps ἐμφάνισ') seems to be right; but ἰδίην is, I think, also corrupt, while εἰς may easily be a repetition of the last syllable of ἡμφάνισ'. I would read

εἶδεν, ἀριστεῖν ἡμφάνισ' ἀμφαδίην.

256, 1 οἷδε ποτ' Αἰγαίοιο βαρύβρομον οἶδμα
λιπόντες

Ἐκβατάνων πεδῖον κείμεθ' ἐν μεσάτῃ.
ἵδατος Αἰγ. Stadtm. Perhaps οἶνοπος.

286, 4 τὰ δ' ὄλβια κείνα μελαθρα
φροῦδα. '/. πάσης ἐλπίς ὄλωλε Τύρου.

(On Nicanor, a rich Tyrian who perished in a shipwreck.) The conjecture which Stadtmüller prints in his text

φροῦδ', ἐφόδον δὲ πάτρης ἐλπίς ὄλωλε Τύρου,

hardly gives an adequate meaning, and it violates the principle that when there is a lacuna it is dangerous to alter the adjacent text. Perhaps simply: φροῦδ', ἅμα καὶ πάσης.

291, 3 ἦ γὰρ ὁρνομένου πόντου, δείσασα
θαλάσσης

ὑβριν ὑπὲρ κοίλου δοῦρατος ἐξέπεσες.
δείσασα is undoubtedly corrupt. Reiske's λένουσου may be right, but I suggest θαμβεύσα, which is distinctly superior in meaning. The corruption can be easily explained by parablepsia: θ α < μ β εῦσα θ α > λένουσας. δείσασα was then inserted, an unfortunate supplement. (This explanation would also apply to Stadtm.'s conjecture θαρσοῦσα, but θαμβεύσα or θαμβοῦσα is better).

302, 2 τῶν αὐτοῦ τις ἕκαστος ἀπολλυμένων
ἀνιᾶται,

Νικόδικον δὲ φίλοι καὶ πόλις ἦδε
πολύ†.

ποθεῖ Brunck, Πόλη (urbs Istriae) Salmasius, πολύ Boissonade &c. I may hazard yet another guess: Παλεις. But the absence of any indication, in this 'Simonidean' distich that Nikodikos was slain in war, forbids us to suppose that he could have been one of the two hundred Παλεις of Cephallenia (Hdt. ix. 28) who fought in the Greek army at Plataea.

325, 1 τόσσ' ἔχω, ὅσσ' ἔφαγόν τε καὶ ἔμπιον†
καὶ μετ' ἐρωτων
τέρπν' ἰδάν†.

With the version ἔμπιον we might read ὅσσα τ' ἐρώτων (or ἐρώτων).

377, 6 ὥστ' ἀγορεύσαι
πῆλόν 'Οδυσσεῖν καὶ βάτον Ἰλιάδα
Stadtm. conjectures βόλβιτον for καὶ βάτον. We might propose, in a similar sense, καὶ σκύβαλ'. But βάτον is sound. Parthenius compared the Iliad to a wild bramblebush, meaning to imply that it wanted the artistic elaboration of Alexandrine compositions.

382, 5 ἦ τύμβευε κενούσα καθ' ὕδατος.
κανούσα Heck, κυθούσα or ἐνέχονσα Stadtm.
Perhaps μ' ἐλούσα or ἐλεούσα.

386, 2 δύσμορος ἦ μαστῶν... ἔπηξα γάλα.
στάζον Stadtm. alii alia. Perhaps ναστῶν.

ib. 4 'Αἶδεω πολὺς ὄλβος ἐμῆς ὠδίνος ἀριθμός,
ἦ τέκον. ὦ μεγάλης λείψανα πυρκαϊῆς.

The least violent changes which have been proposed are those of Reiske and Heck, who would read respectively ὠδ., ἀριθμούς ἦ τ., and ὠδ., ἀριθμὸν ἦ τ. But ἀριθμός should not be altered. Read

ἦ <τε> τέκον, μεγάλης κ.τ.λ.

My children and I who bore them enrich Hades.

393, 2 Μή με κόνι κρύψῃτε, τί γάρ; πάλι μῆδ' ἐπὶ ταύτης

ῥόνος οὐκ ὄνοσθ' ἡγαῖαν ἐμοὶ τίθετε.

οὐ γνωτὴν Salmas., ὀγκωτὴν Huschke. I have no doubt that the true reading is οὐκ ἄνυτῃν. Although the usual form of this verbal is ἄνυστός, ἄνυτός is justified by the Homeric ἄνυττος and by the form ἄνυτικός. ἄνυττον is precisely the sense required.

ib. 6 πάρκειμαι σταθερῇ μυμμένει ὡς ἀταφος ἀρκοῦμαι Jacobs. Perhaps αἰρεῖμαι.

408, 3 ἄρτι γὰρ Ἰππώνακτος ὁτ' καὶ τοκέων καταβαύζας

ἄρτι κεκοίμηται θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.

I suggest ὅτ' ὁ κύντατα κάρτα βαύζας.

409, 8 καὶ Ζεύς τοι κρέσσων Ἑνοσίχθωνος ἄλλ' Ἑνοσίχθων

τοῦ μὲν ἔφην μείων ἑθναίων δ' ὕπατος.

ἄλλ' ἐτέρων or ἀσσοτάτω δ' Stadtm. But nothing is to be done with ἑθναίων which is clearly an unfortunate supplement to fill up a gap. The correction is perfectly simple:

τοῦ μὲν ἔφην μείων <μιοτέρων> δ' ὕπατος.

411, 6 ὦ στόμα πάντως

δεξιῶν, ἀρχαίων ἡσθὰ τις ἡμίων.

(πάντως seems the simplest correction of πάντων.) Violent emendations have been proposed. Perhaps read ἀρχαίους 'in the eyes of the ancients.'

444, 1 Χείματος οἰνωθέντα τὸν Ἀνταγόρῳ μέγαν οἶκον.

Stadtm. proposes ὀχληθέντα, and other suggestions have been made since Scaliger's οἰωθέντα. But the text is sound. οἶκον means the household as well as the house, as is shown by the verb which governs it, ἔλαθεν. διὰ τὴν μέθην, in the lemma, implies the reading οἶν, but this is not of much consequence.

447, 2 Σύντομος ἦν ὁ ξείνος ὁ καὶ στίχος οὐ μακρὰ λέξω

Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρής ἔπ' ἐμοὶ δολιχός.

Stadtmüller's ἐπόνει δολιχόν is unacceptable. O. Schneider (Callimachea 415) adopts ἔπ' ἐμοὶ from Planudes, reading

Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρής ὑπ' ἐμοί. δολιχός.

That is δολιχός ὁ στίχος, and I feel sure that this explanation of δολιχός is right. On the other hand ὑπ' ἐμοί is superfluous and therefore condemned by the point of the epigram. The question is, what information was needful or desirable in addition to the name, father's name, and country of the

dead? Surely, whether he died young or old; some indication of his age. σύντομος suggests that the epigram is on a child; and I therefore propose to read

Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρής δεκέτης. δολιχός.

δεκέτης might have disappeared after Κρής, and ἐπ' ἐμοί or ὑπ' ἐμοί was a convenient commonplace to fill its place.

465, 3 γράμμα διακρίναντες, ὁδοιπόρε, πέτρον ἰδωμεν

λευρὰ περιστέλλειν ὅστέα φατὶ τίνος

The meaning clearly is that the leaves (φύλλων ἡμιθαλείς στέφανοι l. 2) are to be drawn aside in order to read the inscription. Read φύλλα διακρίναντες. Since φ and ρ are written in papyri with the perpendicular strokes reaching far below the line, φ under certain conditions might be mistaken for γρ, and φύλλα read as γρυμα. γράμμα would easily follow.

467, 3 ὦλετ' ἐμᾶς ὠδίνος ὁ πᾶς πόνος εἰς πόνον ἔπῃρ.

εἰς σποδὸν εἰς Canter, ἐς κενὸν, ἐς Stadtm. alii alia. Perhaps ἐς πνόον, ἐς πῆρ. (See Hesych. πνόος). Cp. 468, 8 εἰς ἀνέμους.

484, 3 ἡ μὲν ἀρίστη οὖσα καὶ εὐτεκνος.

ἀριστοτόκεια might be conjectured.

537, 1, 2 ἡρίον οὐκ ἐπὶ πατρὶ πολυκλαύτου δ' ἐπὶ παιδὸς

Λύσις ἄχει κενὴν τήνδ' ἀνέχωσε κόνιν.

Stadtmüller observes: 'offendit ἐπὶ praep. bis ratione differenti adhibita.' We should boldly read πολυκλαύτω δ' ἐπὶ παιδί. The genitive was probably due to an erroneous connexion of ἐπὶ with ἄχει.

614, 8 τὼς δὲ συνενύως

ἔκτανε ἢ τήνας τῇδε βιησόμενος.

Stadtm. supplies δῆ, but τῇδε can hardly be sound. καὶ τ. στείλει Reiske, καὶ τ. εἴλε Brunck. I propose: καὶ τήνας σπεῦδε. πένδε is not far from τεῖδε.

ib. 12 ἂψ δ' ἐπὶ πάτρην

ἦκετον; ἐν δ' αὐτῷ κείσθον ἀποφθιμένα.

αὐτὰ vulg. Read αὐτοῦ—in your country and in this spot.

622, 34 εἵπετό οἱ σκυλάκων τις ὁ καὶ βοσίν, ὃς

φάγε λεπτήν

σχοῖνον ἀνελκομένῳ χραινομένῳ μέλιτι.

Various suggestions have been made for ἀνελκομένῳ; but it is perfectly intelligible, if we suppose that Borchos, suspended on the face of a cliff at the end of a rope, passed honeycombs to a comrade who drew them up by means of another cord, and that in this process the honeycombs (μέλι ἀνελκόμενον)

rubbed against the *σχοῖνες* which supported Borchos.

640, 3 νῆα γὰρ ἀπλοῖη πεπεδημένον ἔφθασε ναύταις

ληιστέων ταχινὴ δίκροτος ἐσσυμένη.

Perhaps the simple correction ἔφθασεν αὐτοῦ is as likely as ἔφθασε κοντοῖς (Stadtm.) or any of the emendations that have been proposed.

643, 4 ἦρπασας, ὦ ἄλλιστ' Ἀῖδη, τί πρόωρον ἐφίεις

μοῖραν τῇ πάντως σοὶ πόθ' ἔσσομένη; σείῳ ποτ' Plan. (which does not explain the origin of ποθ'). Perhaps σοὶ ποθ' ὑπεσσομένη.

646, 3 ὦ πάτερ, οὗ τοι ἐτ' εἰμί, μέλας δ' ἐμὸν ὄμμα καλύπτει

ἦδη ἀποφθιμένας κνάνεος θάνατος.

μέλαν δ' Brunck, τάλαιν' Bergk, νέφος δ' Stadtm. I propose πέλας δ'.

652, 7 Τιμάρης δὲ κενὸν τέκνον κεκλαυμένον ἀθρῶν

τύμβου δακρύει παῖδα Τελευταγόρην.

κεκλαυμένος Herm., κεκλυσμένος Jacobs, &c. Read κεκλημένον—'the empty tomb, called his son's.' κεκλ. is appropriate to a cenotaph, which might be described as a sepulchre only in name.

656. καὶ πᾶν κέρνυται ὑπ' ὀξείης παλιούρου κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps καὶ κατὰ πᾶν κέρνυται.

665, 3 ὤλεσε καὶ Πρόμαχον πνοιὴ μία, κύμα δὲ ναύτας

ἄθροον ἐς κοίλην ἐστυφέλιξεν ἅλα.

δ' ἐν ἄτης Unger, δ' ἐν οὕτως Stadtm. Perhaps κύμα δ' ἐν αὐτῆς (sc. πνοιῆς, caused by the wind).

710, 2 πένθιμε κρωσσί,
ὅστις ἔχεις Ἀῖδα τὰν ὀλίγαν σποδιάν.

It may be suspected that τις is a metrical supplement, inserted to replace a word that fell out before δς. Perhaps <κτῆμ> or <σκόλ> δς ἔχεις Ἀῖδα τὰν ὀλίγαν σποδιάν.

713, 4 τοιγάρτοι μνήμης οὐκ ἤμβροτεν οὐδὲ μελαίνης

νυκτὸς ὑπὸ σκιερῇ κωλύεται πτέρνγνι.

Read εἰλύεται (with ὕ, as sometimes in late poets).

719, 1 Τελλῆνος ὅδε τύμβος ἔχω δ' ὑπὸ τ' βώλεω πρέσβυν.

βώλεω points not to βώλακι (Reiske), but to βώλεσι, and perhaps it would not be too rash to assume for βώλος this heteroclitite form.

726, 6 καὶ τι παριστίδους δινευμένη ἄχρῃ ἐπ' ἧοῦς

κείνον Ἀθηναίης σὺν Χάρισιν δόλιχον.

(With τι sc. ἦευσεν from preceding distich.) κοινὸν Emperius; Stadtmüller conjectures κλεινὸν or τεῖνεν. Read δείνον (δῖνον)—δολιχόν.

id. 7 χειρὶ στρογγύλλουσ' ἢ μερόεσσα κρόκην.

One might conjecture ἡμερόνυκτι (= νυχθήμερον), but there is no visible reason for such a corruption. Perhaps ἡμερόεσσα conceals some coinage like ἡμερόθησσα.

id. 10 ἢ καλὰ καὶ καλῶς Πλατῆς ὑφηνάμενη. ἡλακάτην καλῶς Heck. Read rather ἡλάκαθ' ἢ καλῶς.

729, 1 Εὐθήης Τριτωνίς ἐπ' οὐκ ἀγαθαῖς ἐλοχείθῃ κληδόσιν.

I am surprised to find that Stadtmüller accepts F. G. Schmidt's poor conjecture εὐειδῆς. Tritonis was doubtless a courtesan, and εὐθήης has the same force as *bona*. In l. 4 τὰ πολλὰ means her large business.

733, 6 ἐτέων δ' οὐ φθόνος ἴσοσίη.

Stadtmüller prints in his text Meineke's ἔσθ' ὁσίης, though not satisfied with it. I would read: ἢ ὅσθ' ὁσίη, which, allowing for etacism, involves only the insertion of θ.

id. 8 αἰ δὲ παλαιαὶ
πρῶθ' ἡμεῖς Ἀῖδην πρὶν ἢ ἀνιέμεθα.

Stadtmüller is nearly right, I think, in supposing that ἀνιέμεθα represents ἀνιέμεθα which excellently expresses the peaceful dissolution of old age. His conjecture, however, is weakened if we have to resort to the further change at the beginning of the verse of πρῶται ἡμεῖς, or something of the kind, which he proposes for πρῶθ' ἡμεῖς. On the other hand, instead of ἀνιέμεθα we should read, I think, ἀνιέμεθ' ἅμα. The perfect here is better than the imperfect: and if we

suppose that ἅμα was written above (ἀνιέμεθα), the corruption can be explained. I would read, without any other change,

ἀῖδην πρὶν ἀνιέμεθ' ἅμα,
taking ἀῖδην as an inner accusative with ἀνιέμεθα. ἀῖδης was the ἀνείσις.

725, 2 ἐς ἀπρύγετον νύκτα κατερχομένη.

Perhaps ἀφρύνκτον, death's torchless night.

748, 7 δᾶμος αἰὲ μακαριστός, ὃς ἄσπεριν Ἡρακλείης

οὐρανίων νεφῶν τεύξεν ἐπ' εὐρύλων.

Stadtmüller reads ὅσαν κτίσιν, and makes various suggestions on the second line. I suggest that in these verses lofty Heracles is fancifully conceived as a staircase for its eponymous hero to his heavenly abode, and

that the lemmatist was right in reading
Ἡρακλῆος. I would restore

ὅς ἀμβασιν Ἡρακλῆος
οὐρανίαν νεφέων τεύξειν ἐπ' εὐρύαλων
Since these notes were written, I read

Professor Ellis's review of Stadtmüller's
edition in *C.R.* Dec. 1899. I observe that
he has made a somewhat similar suggestion
on 733, 6.

J. B. BURY.

ON TWO EPIGRAMS OF THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY.

PROF. BURY's paper of suggestions on
the second volume of Stadtmüller's *Antho-
logia Graeca* has recalled to my mind two
epigrams in the first one upon which I
believe that I have new proposals to offer.

The first is the anonymous epigram in
the anthology of Constantinus Cephalas
(Stadtm. 100), which I give in the form in
which it appears in Mr. W. R. Paton's
Anthologiae Graecae Erotica.

A. χαῖρε κόρη. B. καὶ δὴ σύ. A. τίς ἡ
πρῶτος; B. τί πρὸς σέ;
A. οὐκ ἀλόγως ζητῶ. B. δεσπότης ἡμετέρη.
A. ἐλπίζειν ἔξεστι. B. θέλεις δέ τί; A. νύκτα.
B. φέρεις τι;
A. χρυσίον. B. εὐθύμει. A. † καί †.
B. τόσον οὐ δύνασαι.

τόσον is Paton's emendation for τόσον,
which Stadtmüller retains (dividing the
dialogue A. καὶ τόσον. B. οὐ δύνασαι); and
it appears to be a right one. But then of
course καί is corrupt. I propose τῇ. The
gallant holds out the gold piece. If τῇ became
τε, a further corruption to καί was almost
inevitable.

The second is Leonidas of Tarentum's
address εἰς Ἑρωτα τοξότην (no. 187):

οὐκ ἀδίκειν τὸν Ἑρωτα, γλνκύν μαρτύρομαι
αὐτὴν
Κύπριν βέβλημαι δ' ἐκ δολίου κέραος

καὶ πᾶς τεφροῦμαι θερμὸν δ' ἐπὶ θερμῷ ἰάλλει
ἀτρακτον, λωφᾶ δ' οὐδ' ὅσον ἰοβολῶν
χῶ θνητὸς τὸν ἀλιτρὸν ἐσώκει θνητὸς ὁ δαίμων
τίσσομαι ἐγκλήμων δ' ἐσσομ' ἀλεξιόμενος;

Mr. Paton rightly says that line 1 is
unintelligible. But read λύκος, μαρτύρομαι
αὐτὴν. Love's own mother will say how
fierce a beast he is. So Meleager speaks of
him as a lynx, λύγκα παρ' αἰπολίοις.

Of line 5 some twelve or thirteen con-
jectures are quoted by Stadtmüller, none of
them affording the least satisfaction, except
Piccolo's ἔχω καὶ δαίμον' ὁ θνητὸς, the first
half of which occurred to me independently.
As I do not know how this scholar under-
stood the passage, I would say that to me
it contains a very patent allusion to the
phrase εἶρε θεὸς τὸν ἀλιτρὸν, Leonidas sug-
gesting that in this case the tables shall be
turned and the mortal will punish the god.
I would propose χῶ θνητὸς τὸν ἀλιτρὸν ἔχω
καὶ θνητὰ σ', ὁ δαίμων, τίσσομαι. θνητὰ =
mortalia, i.e. 'a punishment such as mortals
feel,' a punishment in kind, a use amply
illustrated in the lexicons. ὁ δαίμων is
exactly the English 'you god.' For this
idiomatic employment of the nominative see
e.g. Ar. Ach. 242 πρότ' ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν ὀλίγον
ἢ κανηφόρος, and the grammars as Kühner-
Gerth, ii. 1, p. 47.

J. P. POSTGATE.

UPON VIRGIL, AENEID VI., Vss. 893-898.

THE February number of the *Classical
Review* contains an interpretation of the
porta cornea and *porta eburna* of which I
venture to say Virgil was wholly uncon-
scious. Without going through the history
of conjecture on this subject, I proceed to
give my own interpretation, which I have
held and taught for over thirty years. The
lines are intended as an indication of time

—no more and no less, meaning that Aeneas
terminates his stay in the world of the
departed *before midnight*. At dawn he has
entered it (vs. 255). While talking with
Deiphobus, he is reminded by the Sibyl that
midday is long past (Vss. 535-539) while
he has all Tartarus to hear about, the bough
to deposit, and all Elysium to explore. The
review being ended and advice given, the

datum tempus draws to its close, and Anchises brings him to the gates of sleep to make his exit. All commentators whom I have ever read assume that both of these gates afford an equal passage at this or any time. But such was no part of the myth. After midnight, the gate of horn is opened for true dreams, or rather in Virgil's words, "truth-telling shades"; before midnight, therefore, only the ivory gate, through which deceitful dreams pass. When, therefore, Aeneas and the Sibyl are dismissed by the ivory gate, it is because their departure is taken before midnight.

The *loci classici* for the belief that true dreams find their way out after midnight or towards morning are pre-eminently Horace, *Sat.* i. 10, 33, and Ovid, *Heroides* xix, 195. Almost equally to the point are Moschus ii. 2, and Plat. *Crito* 44 A. On this latter Stallbaum quotes *Odyssey* iv. 841, xx. 82-91. The second of these is not very clear, and the former would be more satisfactory if it did not turn on the obscure word ἀπολῦσθαι, which if we can judge from *Iliad* xxii. 317, may mean just after sunset, instead of just before sunrise. But the general drift of the tradition that only dreams after midnight are *vera*, and have the gate of horn open to them is unmistakable.

There are not wanting other passages in Virgil to the same effect, notably *Aeneid* viii. 68 *segg.* *Aeneid* v. 835, 840, and v. 738, taken together are very instructive. Neptune sends a deceitful dream to Patruvius just before midnight; Anchises comes as a *vera facies*, *verus nuntius* to Aeneas as soon as midnight is past, and departs when he "scents the morning air." Turnus's vision of Allecto (vii, 406 *segg.*) takes place at midnight (414). It is a marvellous compound of fact and fiction. Hector's appearance to Aeneas is said to be at the *prima quies* (ii. 268). But according to Deiphobus (vi. 513), the revelry had been kept up well into the night, so that the *prima quies* would not have come till after midnight.

In this vision of Hector it is to be noted

how delicately accurate Virgil is in his description of dreams. Aeneas imagines that the Penates and sacred implements are brought to him by the shade of his lamented friend; in fact he receives them from Panthus (ii. 320).

We may notice also that Virgil's conceptions of the Elysian fields as a region illuminated by sun and stars, into which Aeneas emerges after going through the *alta caligo* of the *lugentes campi* and the Banks of Phlegethon is exactly conformed to what any one now sees in the country west of Naples, where the scene of *Aeneid* vi. is laid. Volcanic convulsions since Virgil's time have so changed the face of the country that a specific identification of each spot he had in mind is futile. But the traveller now is carried into the very bowels of the earth, on the shoulders of all but naked men, plashing through seething waters, lighted only by Tartarean torches. When he comes out into the full sunlight of some sequestered amphitheatre, like the Solfatara, with which all volcanic countries abound, though the particular ones change from age to age, he feels in another world, knowing its own air and sun. The soil which cracks and fumes with sulphur under your feet no doubt teems with forebodings of subterranean torment, scenes into which one may now penetrate even deeper than Aeneas; but there are a score of spots close by Baiae, Bauli, and Cumae, which are the very type of Elysium. The circle of the bay of Naples contains all the charms of Nature in perfection, interlocking with her utmost horrors. Though Vesuvius was not active till Virgil had been all but a century dead, all volcanic regions then known, like Aetna, Lipari and Avisanctus, fascinated him.

Every reader of Dante will remember how his progress through the Inferno and Purgatorio under Virgil's escort is marked off by repeated references to the movements of sun and stars through the twenty-four hours.

WILLIAM EVERETT.

ON VIRGIL, *AENEID*, XII. 813-818.

(Juno is addressing Jupiter.)

Inturnam misero, fateor, succurrere fratri
suasi et pro uita maiora audere probavi,
non ut tela tamen, non ut contenderet
arcum :

815

adiuro Stygii caput inplacabile fontis,
[una superstitio superis quae reddita
diuis].
et nunc cedo equidem pugnasque exosa
relinquo.

I would thus print the lines, bracketing line 817 as the note of a glossator, whose knowledge of the ancient theology exceeded his power of writing Latin. (This, though Lactantius, *Inst.* 1, 11, quotes the verse.) The line, considering the speaker and the hearer, is superfluous; unless we suppose it to be an expression of regret that the gods have only one method of asseveration open to them. Moreover *superstitio* is explained to mean here:—(1) 'an object that inspires dread' (Lewis-Short, and Benoist-Goelzer), or (2), der ängstlich bindende Eidschwur (Georges), and the present passage is, naturally, the only example given in any lexicon of this impossible use. In the only other passage where Virgil has the word *superstitio* (viii.

187), it bears its ordinary sense. The expression, 'superi diui,' too, where *superi* is an adjective, is unknown to the poet: where the gods are meant, *superi* always stands by itself as a substantive in Virgil. Further, what meaning can be got out of 'reddita (est)'? The word must be taken in one or other of two ways:—(1) 'was (has been) restored,' or (2) 'was (has been) given as owing.' Either sense fails to justify itself. The composer of the line shows 'padding' in the use of the unnecessary 'diuis,' and the same vice, added to ignorance of its proper meaning, in using 'reddita' for 'data.'

A. SOUTER.

Aberdeen.

ON SOME PASSAGES OF VALERIUS FLACCUS.

ii. 235

diras aliae ad fastigia taedas
Iniciunt adduntque domos.

In support of the conj. *abduntque* (*J. of Philol.* ix. 53) may be cited *Just.* xxiv. 1, 6 *quoniam conspectum illis metus et incendiorum fumus abstulerat*. Here the body of incendiaries (*illis*) are themselves hidden from view by the smoke of the burning houses: in Valerius the houses themselves cannot be seen for the volumes of smoke in which they are wrapt.

337

Forsitan hoc factum taceat iam fulmen in
antro.

This seems right as it stands. 'It may be that the bolt is already made, and now silent within this cavern,' i.e. the forging of it is completed and therefore no sound of hammering can be heard.

619

stupuitque fragore

†Ianus et occiduis regnator montibus At-
lans.

Langen in his careful, but not always convincing commentary (Berlin 1896) retains *Ianus*, and supposes the poet to mean that disruption of two continents, such as was supposed to have happened at the Hellespont and in Sicily and Africa, took place in the early prime of the world, when Ianus was king in Italy. It is equally possible that *Ianus* is a corruption: *Haemus* or

Aemus might be suggested; then the two mountains, Haemus and Atlas, would be taken as representing the two countries (Thrace and Libya) respectively. Cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* i. 6 fin.

641, 2

Non tamen haec adeo semota neque ardua
tellus
Longaque iam populis tñperuia lucis Eoae.

Madvig conj. *inter uia* and *tam* for *iam*: 'non tam longam uiam populis lucis Eoae (hoc est suis, Asiaticis) interiicere et eos a ceteris occidentalibusque separare dicit.'

This explanation ill agrees with 641. Cyzicus, King of Cyzicus, would then say 'This land where I dwell is not so far removed or inaccessible, nor is the journey between so long (to traverse) for the tribes of the East.' Far removed, that is, from the home of the Argonauts, Greece. After telling the Argonauts that Cyzicus was not so far from the west, he would hardly go on to say 'nor have the Eastern peoples such a distance to traverse between themselves and Greece.' Rather, he would say: 'Cyzicus is not so remote, nor the clime of the East (in which C. is included) at such a distance for the nations of the world to traverse.' I think therefore that Valerius wrote

Longaque tam populis in iter uia lucis Eoae.
uia lucis eoae = the path of the morning, in *iter* after *longa* 'distant for travelling.' *populis* in a general sense, the nations, with some

extra notion of the more civilized and cultured regions of the west.

iii., 169, 170

occumbens †et nunc ait Herculis armis
Donum ingens semperque tuis mirabile
fatis.

For *et* I suggest *fer*, on which *Donum* would depend.

222

iam passim uacuos disiecta per agros
Credit ouans: tales †audit, ea gaudia
fingit
Ira deum.

Köstlin conj. *obitus*, Schenkl *aestus*, Bury *auctus*. Nearer to the reading of Vat. would be *aditus* 'such approaches of frenzied joy.' Similarly Curtius v. 9, 3 *aditum nefariae spei praeeparans*. See on vi. 681.

703

Iamne animis, iam mente pares? atque
inclita †uului
Dextera?

Madvig conj. *aeque* (so Voss) *i. fulgit Dextera?* explaining 'iamne aeque inclita dextra uestra est?' But (1) *fulgit* is not a good form for *fulget* (2) the flash of Hercules' sword, is a bad description of him as a hero. Perhaps *satne i. fulsit Dextera?* 'Has his far-famed right-hand done all it need to support you?' *fulsit* perf. of *fulcire*.

v. 645

Est honor hic etiam suus: ego clara My-
cenes
Culmina

My conj. *est honor his etiam suus*, [est.] *ego c. M. (J. of Philol. ix. 57)* is very like Prud. Passio Vincentii 77, 8 *At sunt et illic spiritus, Sunt*.

686, 7

Donec et Aecten inopis post longa senec-
tae
Exilia heu magnis quantum licet †inopia
fatis
Nata iuuet Graiusque nepos in regna re-
ponat.

If Gronov's explanation of *inopia* (so the Monacensis for *inopia* of Vat.) as not included in the exclamatory parenthesis,

heu magnis quantum licet, inopia,
fatis!

Nata

is thought too venturous, it is still possible to retain *licet*, translating 'till Aectes is restored to his throne by his daughter Medea,—a daughter alas, impious to the full extent allowed to a high destiny:' *inopia (in) quantum licet magnis fatibus (esse)*. Till we know more details about the later MSS. of Valerius, (see A. C. Clark's important paper, *Cl. Rev.* for 1899 p. 119, *On the literary discoveries of Poggio*), it is the course of wisdom not to alter the reading of Vat. unless it is absolutely untranslatable or impossible.

vi. 123

Namque ubi iam uiresque aliae, notusque
refutat
Arcus (Argus Vat.) et inceptus iam lancea
temnit erilis

refutat, which Langen alters to *recusat*, is too rare a word to be rejected hastily, and if it is rejected, *renutat* which Lambinus substituted for it in Lucr. iii, 350 *si quis corpus sentire refutat* (see Munro there), would be a less violent alteration. From Serv. on Georg. iv. 218 *traxit hoc de Celtiberorum more, qui, ut in Sallustio legimus, se regibus deuouent et post eos uitam refutant*, it would seem that Sallust had used the word = *negare*. In the passage of Valerius the idea might be this, 'when their strength changes, and the familiar bow (*Argus* a mistake for *Arcus*, as *agnota* for *ac nota*, vi. 535) declines to be strung:' but it would more naturally = 'disproves it' sc. *uires*: in neither case, if I am right, is *inceptus* to be constructed with *refutat*.

163-5

Fratribus aduersa Boreas respondet ab
unda
Aut is apud fluuios uolucrum †clamor.

No doubt *canor*, as Heinsius conjectured; and so Bährens rightly prints. Valerius here has Lucretius in mind, iv. 181 *Paruus ut est cyeni melior canor ille gruum quam Clamor*.

300 sqq.

utque iterum intrat
Vociferans, iterum belli diuersa peragrat,
Lancea caeruleas circum strepit incita
uittas.
Opprimat admissis ferus hunc Gesander
habenis.

hunc of Vat. was changed by Burmann to *hinc*. This is not necessary.

The pronoun is often so used without any marked emphasis, merely to call fresh atten-

tion to or identify the person spoken of, here the seer Aquites, father of Cynus. *Aen. i. 476 Troilus... Fertur equis, curruque haeret resupinus inani, Lora tenens tamen : huic cervixque comaeque trahuntur Per terram. Aen. iii. 492.*

355, 6

Quem pelagi rabies, quem nubila, quemque sequatur
† Ille dies.

Bury extols Haupt's *illuvies*: to me it seems impossible. Why should not *Ille dies* mean 'that day of storm,' when all the winds are contending for the mastery, and the question is which of them is to triumph over the rest? Possibly Valerius was fresh from Lucan's description of such a day of storm v. 597-646. Cf. 615 *A quoties frustra pulsatos aequore montes Obruit illa dies. And again 627 nox illa.*

417

Haut usquam Colchorun animi.

Heinsius, Bährens, Bury all think this wrong. Bury's *Haut quasi* is not far from the letters of Vat., but I am not convinced by it. May it not mean simply that the havoc produced by the scythed chariots was so confusing and disturbing, that the Colchians were completely distracted and could not concentrate their attention anywhere?

559

Centum lecta boum bellator corpora, centum
Pactus equos; his ille animam lucemque rependit
Crudelis.

Langen finds a difficulty in *Crudelis*. Pius (1517) was, I think, right in explaining it of the cruelty of Calais, who will not spare Rhipheus' life for less than 100 choice oxen, 100 horses.¹

bellator is Rhipheus who engages (*pactus*) to give this ransom: *ille* Calais who makes this large demand as an ἀντάξιον (Hom. *Il. ix. 401*) for the life of Rhipheus. In *tandem* the poet seems to mean that the attempted ἀντάξιον did not come off, and to this I refer *iam cassus* (baffled in his attempt at last, not 'lifeless,' which would surely require *lumine* or *vita*), but that Rhipheus was killed by his antagonist.

696 *pharetratis* must I think be wrong. I suggest *figuratis* covered with patterns.

¹ I cannot believe that *crudelis* means 'cruelis in se ipsum' (Io. Wagner).

681

Inimnet e celsis †audientibus improba muris
Virgo, nec ablatam sequitur quaeritue sororem.

audientius Pius, and this is generally accepted by edd. It certainly agrees with Medea's no longer caring to be accompanied by her (supposed) sister. On palaeographical grounds I think it might represent *adeuntibus* (see on iii. 222), which would be constructed with *Inimnet* 'hangs over' i.e. to scan more closely those who come near.

vii. 156

quando ardor hebet leuiorque pudori
Mensque obnixā malo.

Mr. Summers explains this 'since her love is waning, and being thus more mild is become a shame to her;' i.e. Now it is less fierce she feels how shameful her passion was. It is surely more probable that the sense is 'since her passion is dulled, and abates to the approach of shame' i.e. shame asserts itself with increasing strength against passion.

162

I precor atque istum quo me frustratur
amorem
Vince, precor.

Heinsius' *prior* after *Vince* seems right. 'Go, I beg you, and be the first (before me) to overcome that puling affection for parents and home by which she baffles my design' of making her consummate her love for Jason. *istum amorem* is said contemptuously of *family* love, as opposed to the more *erotic* love by which Juno aimed to fulfil her purpose.

457

matura ruebant
Sidera et extremum †suffecerat axe Booten
Possibly *subiecerat* (or *suffugerat*, cf. *Lucr. 4, 360*) *Acta*: Bootes is called *Actaeus* ii. 68.

483

Cur nullos stringunt tua lumina fletus?
'Why do your eyes squeeze out no tears?'
Bitterly, as feeling Jason's real want of love.

752

Nox simul astriferas profert optabilis umbras.

Prof. Whitley Stokes pointed out in the Academy of Jan. 3, 1885 that this line is

quoted in the Book of Armagh, a MS. written in Ireland about 707. Nox non inruit et fuscis tellurem non amplexerat alis et pallor non tantus erat noctis et astriferas non induxerat bosferus umbras. But the *induxerat* and *bosferus* (? Hesperus) make the identification uncertain.

viii. 167, 8

commune fuisset

Aut certe nunc omne nefas.

The sense becomes clear by writing *per te non*. 'The guilt would have been shared by us both (Medea and her mother) or would not have been attributable all of it to you' (Medea).

Much has still to be done for the criticism of Valerius. The latest contributions to the subject that I have seen, besides Mr. Bury's¹ articles in *Hermathena* xix. and xx., *Cl. Review* x., and Prof. Postgate's, *J. of Philol.* xxii., xxvii., are the *Studia in Val. Flaccum* of Johan Samuelsson, Upsala 1899 (mainly on the syntax and grammatical peculiarities of the poet), and Reuss' paper in *Philologus* N.F. xii. (1899) in which a considerable number of passages in i.-iv. are considered.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

¹ Mr. Bury's new edition of the text of Valerius is included in the forthcoming fasciculus of Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum*.

NOTES ON JUVENAL I. 62 AND VII. 114.

Cum fas esse putet curam sperare
cohorts

Qui bona donavit praesepibus et
caret omni

Maiorum censu, dum pervolat axe
citato

Flaminium puer Automedon? nam
lora tenebat

62 Ipse, lacernatae cum se iactaret amicae.

The satirist's meaning seems perfectly clear¹ and may be stated as follows: A patrician youth who has squandered his ancestral wealth, so far forgets what Roman dignitas in a man of his social rank demanded, that he actually *drives in person*² through one of the most frequented streets of Rome, for the purpose of showing off to his mistress.³

But if these verses, as a whole, offer no difficulties, the term *lacernatae*, as applied to *amica*, seems to me open to insuperable objections and I cannot understand how the commentators can have rested so com-

placently satisfied with it. For we are simply told, that the *amica* was dressed as a man, the *lacerna* being a garment exclusively worn by men.⁴ It does not seem to have occurred to any one to ask the certainly pertinent question as to the poet's possible motive in assigning such an attire or disguise to the *amica* on the particular occasion under notice. And yet it requires but little reflection to see that such a disguise is wholly irrelevant and pointless, for Juvenal is not here describing 'mores meretricum.' In the second place, a *lacerna*, being a loose, short cloak would not even have effected the alleged disguise, the *paenula*, for instance, also a male garment, being far better suited for the purpose. On the other hand, it is not Juvenal's custom, as every careful student of his style well knows, to degrade highly expressive attributives to the level of otiose and meaningless 'epitheta ornantia' or metrical stopgaps, on the contrary, they are invariably chosen with a distinct object in view, but what his object may have been in calling the woman *lacernata* here, is inconceivable, quite apart from internal objections to the word itself.

¹ I intentionally ignore, as unworthy of serious attention, those interpretations that do not identify *Automedon* with *ipse*, or see in the latter a covert allusion to Nero or Domitian.

² That this was considered a violation of social etiquette seems to be also implied in the contrast noted by Tac. *Agr.* 12, *honestior auriga* sc. quam apud nos.

³ The false pretence involved was doubtless due to a desire to retain the favour of the *amica*, which might well have been withdrawn, had she learned of her lover's impoverished condition. With his conduct, cp. Petron. 38, *inclinatis rebus suis, cum timeret, ne creditores illum conturbare existimarent hoc titulo auctionem proscriptis*: 'C. Julius Proculus auctionem faciet rerum supervacuarum.'

⁴ That *lacernatae amicae* involves an obscene allusion to the notorious Sporus, under Nero, is a perfectly gratuitous assumption; for not even a contemporary Roman reader could possibly have detected or understood it, and this for the following reasons: (1) As the *Automedon* unquestionably represents a *type*, there was absolutely nothing to suggest an *historical* individual in the *amicae*. (2) *lacernatae...amicae* can only mean a woman dressed as a man; the identification with Sporus, however, imperatively demands the very opposite interpretation, namely an *amicus*, characterized by some attributive as a *woman*, because of his conduct (Cp. Suet. *Nero* 28, Dio Cass. 63, 13, 2).

Nor is this all, for commentators have also, so far as I have been able to discover, failed to consider the *locality*, where the poet must have supposed this amica to have been. There are only two possibilities and both are incompatible with *lacernatae*. She was either *in a house* on the Flaminian Way or else on the *crowded street* itself.¹

If the former be thought preferable, *lacernatae* is quite out of place, because the garment was never worn in-doors. If, on the other hand, we suppose the woman to have watched her lover from the street, we must assume that he had notified her previously of his plan; for he could not well have taken it for granted that his friend would be present to watch his unique performance. Again, he would scarcely have chosen an *unpleasant* day for his drive; but if so, his amica, supposing her present, would not under any circumstances have put on a *lacerna*; for this we are invariably told, was worn only in inclement weather or wherever men were for a long time exposed in the open air, as in the amphitheatre or in the military camp.

It will thus be apparent that *lacernatae*, from whatever point you approach it, is quite inapplicable to *amicae*, in the present context. Under these circumstances, an emendation is methodically justified. And if it not only proves to be paleographically extremely simple, if it does away with all the difficulties just pointed out and at the same time adds another satirical touch to the picture, the fact that it is suggested at this late date ought not to militate against its being generally accepted.

I believe that all the above mentioned conditions are fulfilled by reading *lacernatus* in place of *lacernatae*, and will only mention in passing that *ipse lacernatus cum se iactaret amicae* is a far more natural rhythm than the sudden stop in the middle of the first foot.² Not only, says the poet does this bankrupt aristocrat so far forget himself as to drive in person, like a professional Automedon, but he actually dons a garment which *drivers habitually wore*. That the *lacerna* was also a coachman's cloak³ is most

natural, but as it has not hitherto been so regarded the above assertion must needs be substantiated. This confirmation is happily not wanting. In Petron. ch. 69, a *nequissimus servus* of Habinnas entertains the company with a series of 'tableaux.' He had imitated flute-players and finally, stepping into the middle of the room, gives a pantomimic presentation of *mule-drivers* (*lacernatus cum flagello mulionum fata egit*). Now merely to go through certain gestures with whip in hand was hardly enough to suggest at once *mulionum fata*. To make the allusion more immediately intelligible something else was evidently needed, and this element, necessary to identification, is furnished by *lacernatus*, which would be meaningless or superfluous on any other supposition.

Now this passage from Petronius and the line of Juvenal, as emended, will also serve to vindicate the reading *Lacerna*, in Sat. vii. 114 which has been unwarrantably abandoned in favour of *Lacerta*, found in the inferior MSS., simply because of an inscription which is alleged to contain *Lacerta*, as the name of a charioteer. We shall presently see that the inference thus drawn is erroneous, and that, even if it were intrinsically more plausible than it is, we should still have no right to reject the reading *Lacerna*, unless scholars can with impunity and at pleasure cast aside incontrovertible facts, established by laborious and accurate investigations. One of these universally admitted facts is the general superiority of P, especially when in agreement with the at least two centuries earlier lemmata of its scholias. Accordingly we are not surprised that the reading *Cordi* in PS is now universally accepted over against *Codri* given by *wp*, this example being moreover especially emphasized as proving the superior excellence of P (see e.g. Duff, *Introd.* xliii). Now the passage under discussion presents an absolutely perfect parallel, to wit: *Lacerna*: PS; *Lacerta*: *wp*. By all the canons of textual criticism we ought therefore to give preference to the reading of PS in vii 114. or else be prepared to admit that our oldest MS., though by no means infallible, is *not* our most trustworthy guide, that in other words the recensio of Juvenal lacks a solid foundation.

It follows that only *internal* reasons of overwhelming force could justify our rejection of P in this instance. Is the inscription referred to of this nature?

comment translates *lacernatus* in the Petronian passage by 'Kutschermantel.'

¹ Cp. Mart. x. 6, 6, Totaque Flaminia Roma vindenda via; Tac. *Hist.* ii. 64, Flaminiae viae celebritate.

² I know of only two analogous instances in Juvenal, viz. iii. 25, vi. 456.

³ One may compare the characteristic mantle of the German 'Droschkenkutscher,' worn in cold and rainy weather, although a garment of similar cut, but of finer texture, is also used by the well-to-do. So likewise we occasionally hear of costly lacernae, e.g. Mart. v. 8, 5. I note that Friedländer without

It is found on a lamp 'mit einem siegreichen Agitator' and reads as follows;¹ *C. Annius Lacerta Nica—Coraci Nica*. The *Lacerta* here mentioned, so Friedländer conjectured, being a charioteer, is probably an older namesake of Juvenal's charioteer, who simply adopted, as was not uncommon, the name of a famous predecessor. It will be seen at a glance that these are at best only plausible surmises, and as such not sufficient to cause the rejection of a proper name in our most trustworthy MS. On nearer inspection, however, Friedländer's inferences prove themselves to be wholly fallacious. For if *Nica* is a proper name, the charioteer would have been the proud possessor of four names, an intrinsically improbable supposition and disproved by the lonely *Nica* following.

I am convinced that *Nica* is not a proper name at all, but nothing more nor less than the Greek νικά.² *Coraci* (κόρακι) is doubtless

¹ Henzen, cited by Friedländer, *Sittengesch.* ii. 328, 2. The original article is not accessible to me.

² Cp. the πρώτος νίκας in the Didascalia. Greek terms of the race track were in all probability as much in vogue in Rome as the similar English terms were adopted on the continent of Europe. So the words

an instrumental dative of *Corax*, the name of a winning horse. But if so *Lacerta Nica* must be similarly interpreted, i.e. Λακέρτα, another victorious horse, *Lacertas* or *Lacerta* by name. The entire inscription would then run as follows: *C. Annius* (the charioteer or owner of the two horses) Λακέρτα νικά—Κόρακι νικά. Possibly *C. Annius* owned or drove but one horse, while the owner or driver of *Corax* was given in the lacuna. But be this as it may, the charioteer *Lacerta* who is said to have adopted the name of a hypothetical predecessor of great renown and is without any evidence identified with the individual in Juvenal, according to the interpolated class of MSS., ought no longer disturb our reflections. The authority of PS remains unshaken and *Lacerna* will have to be restored to the text, whence it has so rudely been expelled. I shall only add in conclusion, that if the *lacerna* was a distinctive garment of drivers, as was shown above, we can readily understand how *Lacerna* might, as a proper name, be given to an auriga.

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

expressive of approval were also often Greek, e.g. σφῶς, πάλι, euge.

NE PROHIBITIVE IN CICERO.

(Being a summary of the Ciceronian usage from the manuscript of the late
SIR W. D. GEDDES.¹)

In extracting and tabulating the evidence from Cicero, the limits imposed by the space at disposal compel us to be laconically brief, and hence we have had to omit the actual citations, but the references to the sections will be sufficient to guide one to the texts enumerated.

I. RHETORICAL TREATISES.

No evidence of importance except *De Oratore* i. 17, 77; i. 24, 111; iii. 52, 201.

Result in I.: three auxiliary instances for Pres. Subj.

¹ See *Classical Review* for March, p. 97. For Sir W. D. Geddes' terminology the reader is referred to his previous articles, October and November, 1898, and February, 1899.—ED. C.R.

II. ORATIONS.

(1) *Ante-Verrines*.

Rosc. Amer. 26 [† 36], 104; *Divin.* in Q. Caecil. 4, 13—auxiliary to usage with Pres. Subj.

(2) *Verrines*.

ii. Verr. 23, 52. The plural excludes the notion of a 'ficta persona,' and Yonge renders 'do not suppose.'

Auxiliary to Pres. Subj. are: ii. Verr. v. 1, 2; v. 68, 174. Dubious, as depending on punctuation, iv. 66, 148.

(3) *Post-Verrines to Catilinarians, inclusive*.

Cluent. 2, 6. The two sentences opening with 'Deinde' and 'Tum' are claimed as examples of Ne Prohibitive with Pres. Subj.

¹ i.e. quotations No.

Adminicular instances are: Caecin. 16, 46; Cluent. 4, 11; 69, 195.

(4) *Remaining Orations except Philippics.*

Planc. 11, 27; 23, 56.

Adminicular instances are: Post Redictum 1, 1; Sest. 55, 119; Vatin. 5, 13; Rabir. 7, 18; 17, 46.

For Perf. Subj. may be quoted two examples with nihil in Muren. 31, 65, but they are precepts from a schoolmaster, which are virtually quotations and therefore not Ciceronian at first hand.

(5) *Philippics.*

ii. Phil. 5, 10; vii. Phil. 9, 27; xii. Phil. 12, 29 is uncertain.

Result in II.:

Pres. Subj.	Admin.	Perf. Subj.
7	12	0 ¹

III. EPISTLES.

(1) *Ad Familiares.*

Pres. Subj. with Ne Prohibitive.

Fam. i. 9, 23; v. 12, 3; xii. 26, 2; xiii. 1, 2; xvi. 4, 2; 9, 4. N.B.—We omit viii. 1, 1, an instance in Caelius of ne with Pres. Subj.; but, though so far of value, it cannot be claimed as Ciceronian.

Adminicular instances are: Fam. ii. 7, 4; vi. 2, 1; vi. 20, 3; ix. 19, 2; xi. 19, 2; xiii. 8, 1; xiii. 8, 3; xvi. 25, 1.

Perf. Subj. with Ne Prohibitive.

Fam. iii. 11, 5; vii. 17, 2; vii. 18, 3; vii. 25, 2; xvi. 3, 2.

Result in III. (1):

Pres. Subj.	Admin.	Perf. Subj.
6	8	5

III. (2).

Epistolae ad Quintum Fratrem.

Pres. Subj.

i. 1, 4; i. 4, 1; iii. 1. 19; iii. 8, 2.

Adminicular i. 2, 14. (The absence of a demonstrative, places this example in the secondary or adminicular class).

Perf. Subj.

i. 4, 5; ii. 6 (5), 3; ii. 12 (10), 5. N.B.—i. 1, 14 is left as indeterminate.

Result in III. 2:

Pres. Subj.	Admin.	Perf. Subj.
4	1	3

¹ i.e. no example of Cicero's own, apart from quotations.

III. (3).

Epistolae ad Atticum.

Pres. Subj.

i. 6, 2; xi. 12, 4; i. 11, 1; ii. 4, 1; ix. 18, 3; xi. 12, 2; xii. 39, 1; xiii. 23, 3; xiii. 49, 2; xiv. 1, 2.

Adminicular examples: xi. 7, 3; xi. 10, 2; xi. 25, 1; xiii. 19, 1. N.B.—Quo minus mirere of viii. 1, 3 is virtually equivalent to 'ne mirere,' but is left *in medio* although it might have been fairly included in the Pres. Subj. list above.

(Similar but non-Ciceronian, from Caesar and Caelius: x. 8 (B), 1; x. 9 (A), 1; x. 9 (A), 2).

Perf. Subj.

i. 9, 2 (Orelli has v.l. dubites alongside of dubitaris); ii. 5, 1; iv. 15, 6; iv. 16 (b), 7; v. 11, 7; vii. 3, 2; ix. 9, 1; x. 13, 1; xvi. 2, 5.

Nine examples of Perf. Subj. with Ne.

N.B.—Four examples with nihil: v. 11, 7; v. 21, 14; vii. 8, 2; viii. 2, 1 are probably prohibitive.

Three examples with nec: xii. 23, 3; xiii. 22, 5; xv. 27, 3 are dubious.

Result in III. 3:

Pres. Subj.	Admin.	Perf. Subj.
10	4	9
adding 4 with nihil		
—		
13		

IV. PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS AND FRAGMENTA.

Pres. Subj.

Nat. Deor. ii. 29, 74; Off. ii. 14, 51; Off. ii. 20, 71; Cato 10, 33; Repub. iii. 21, 32; vi. 12, 12; Fragmenta, Pro Tullio § 6.

N.B.—The example in 'De Petitione Consulatus' § 30, being from Cicero's brother Quintus, is not included, but it is good evidence as to the best diction of the time, allowing the Pres. Subj. in a prohibition by Ne.

Auxiliary and adminicular De Fin.: ii. 1, 1; Tusc. Disp. i. 8, 17; Nat. Deor. i. 7, 17; Off. iii. 2, 6.

Perf. Subj.

Acad. Priora ii. 40, 126; Tusc. Disp. i. 41, 98; i. 47, 112; Divinatio ii. 61, 127; Leges ii. 15, 36; Paradoxa v. 41; Repub. i. 19, 32.

Result in IV.:

Pres. Subj.	Admin.	Perf. Subj.
6	4	7

CONJOINT SUMMATION IN CICERO.

	Pres. Subj.	Auxil.	Perf. Subj.	Noli.
I. Rhetorical Treatises	0	3	0	7
II. Orations	7	12	0	69
III. Epistles (1)	6	8	5	10
" (2)	4	1	3	4
" (3)	10	4	9	14
IV. Philosophical Works	6	4	7	13
Total	33	32	24	117

The preponderance of the polite Noli is notable throughout.

The general result seems clear. After the exercise of the largest deductions and notwithstanding the fullest scope for varying subjective estimates of individual instances as well as the accidents of vacillating readings, there remains a sufficient body of evidence to explode the canon of Madvig in its absolute rigidity, and therefore it must cease to be imposed as a canon in classical prose in the Latin tongue.

AN INSCRIPTION OF DYME IN ACHAIA.

THE letter of Quintus Fabius Maximus to the people of Dyme in Achaia, inscribed on a marble slab, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, has been repeatedly published: v. Dobree, *Classical Journal*, xxx. p. 127; Boeckh, *C.I.G.* 1543; Rose, *Inscr. graecae*, p. 393, 405; Hicks, *Manual of Greek Hist. Inscr.* 302; Viereck, *Sermo graecus*, No. 4. Dittenberger, *S.I.G.*² 316 (= *S.I.G.*¹ 242).

The last editor who actually collated the stone seems to have been Hicks, and a fresh collation made last year, when I was enabled by the kindness of Mr. White to take two

impressions, confirms Hicks' readings for the most part. I have, however, discovered traces of letters hitherto overlooked, traces confirmed by the impressions, which refute the restorations proposed for certain passages, and enable me to propose others.

For convenience of reference I give the text as published by Hicks, leaving blank the passages affected by the new collation. For the commentary which follows, I am largely indebted to a lecture delivered by M. Foucart at the Collège de France, of which I have his permission to avail myself.

Ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Λέωνος, γραμματέ-
ος τοῦ συνεδρίου Στρατοκλέος.

- Κοῖντος Φάβιος Κοῖντου Μάξιμος, ἀνθύτατος Ῥωμαίων Δυμαί-
ων τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ συνέδροις καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν· τῶν περὶ
5 Κιλλάνιον συνεδρῶν ἐμφανισάντων μοι περὶ τῶν συντελε-
σθέντων παρ' ὑμῶν ἀδικημάτων, λέγω δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμπρήσε-
ως καὶ φθορᾶς τῶν ἀρχ(εῖ)ων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων γραμμάτων ὧν ἐγε-
γόνει ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ὅλης συγχύσεως Σῶσος Ταυρομένεος ὁ
καὶ τοὺς νόμους γράψας ὑπεναντίους τῇ ἀποδοθείσῃ τοῖς
10 Ἀχαιοῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων πολιτ[εῖαι], περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος διη[λ]θο-
μεν ἐν [Π]άτραις μετὰ τοῦ πα[ρ]όν[το]ς συμβουλίου· ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ διαπρα-
ξάμενοι ταῦτα ἐφείνοντό μοι τῆς χειρίστης κ[ατασ]τάσεως
κα[ὶ] ταραχῆς κα[ὶ] τάπειραν ποιοῦμένο[ι]]ν οὐ μό-
ν[ον] . . .] τῆς πρ[ο]ς ἀλλήλου[ς] ασυναλλα[. . .]ς καὶ χρ[ε]ί[.]
15 . . .] ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀποδεδομένης κατὰ [κ]οινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐ-
λευθερίας ἀλλοτρία καὶ τῇ[ς] ἡμετέ[ρα]ς προαιρέσεως· ἐγ[ὼ] πα-
ρασχομένων τῶν κατηγορῶν ἀληθινὰς ἀποδείξεις, Σῶ-
σον μὲν τὸν γεγονότα ἀρχηγὸν [τ]ῶν πραχθέντων καὶ νο-
μογραφήσαντα ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς ἀποδοθείσης πολιτεῖ-
20 α] κρίνας ἔνοχον εἶναι, θανάτω πα[ρ]εχώρ(η)σα, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ
Φορ[μ]ίσκον Ἐχέσθινεος, τῶν δαμοργῶν τὸν συμπράξαντα
τοῖς ἐμπρήσασιν τὰ ἀρχαία καὶ τὰ δημόσια γράμματα, ἐπεὶ καὶ
αὐτὸς ὡμολόγησεν· Τιμόθεον δὲ Νικία τὸμ μετὰ τοῦ Σώσου

γεγονότα νομογράφον, ἐπεὶ ἔλασσον ἐφαίνετο ἡδικοῦς ἐ-
 25 κέλευσα] προάγειν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὁρκίσας ἐφ' ᾧ] τῇ νομηνίᾳ τοῦ ἐν-
]ς ἔστα[ι] ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐμφανίσας τ[ῶι] ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων στρατη-
 γῶι, ὅπως ἂν [μὴ] πρότερον ἐπ[ι]εισ[ι] πρὸς οἶκον ἐὰν μὴ ἂν . .

The letter deals with the destruction of the archives of Dyme by incendiaries. The crime formed part of a revolutionary attempt directed against the timocracy established by Rome (*Paus.* vii. 16, 6). The leader in the affair, a certain Sosos was condemned to death together with one of his fellow conspirators Phormiskos (?). A third conspirator, Timotheos, is sent to Rome.¹

l. 1-2. These lines are engraved in characters much larger than those in the body of the text. The stone-cutter had, however, begun with a small E which is still visible before ΕΠΙ.

θεοκόλου: an ecclesiastical title. Cf. *B.C.H.* ii. (1878) p. 41 ἐπὶ θεοκόλου—: *ibid.*, p. 98. So again *ibid.*, p. 96 we find

ἐπὶ τὰν Δυμαίαν ἐπὶ τὰν θεομ[. .
 . .]νεοντω θεοκολίαν ἂν ἁ πόλις καθίσταται εἰ.

These inscriptions were all found on what their editors consider to have been the site of Olenos. For the migration of the people of Olenos to Dyme v. *Polyb.* ii. 41.

Γραμματεὺς τοῦ συνεδρίου; cf. *γραμματεὺς τῶν συνεδρίων* at Andania. Ditt. *S.I.G.*¹ 388 = Lebas-Foucart ii. 326*, comm. p. 166.

The συνεδρίον was that of Dyme and not that of the Achaean league, of which league Dyme was one of the original members. For the secretary of the Achaean league we find

ἐπὶ γραμ[μ]ατέος τοῖς Αἰαίοις Στράτωνος
 Lebas-Foucart, ii. No. 16; cf. *ibid.*, No. 12.

3. Who is this Quintus Fabius Maximus?

He is obviously proconsul of Macedonia, as Achaia was not constituted a separate province till 27 B.C. (v. Pauly-Wissowa s.v. Achaia) and it is evident that its subjugation is comparatively recent.

There are four persons to choose from:—

Q. F. M. Aemilianus cos. 145 B.C.

” ” ” Servilianus ” 142 B.C.

” ” ” Allobrogicus ” 121 B.C.

” ” ” Eburnus ” 116 B.C.

Of these the first is improbable, as it is hardly likely that the league was restored so soon as 144 when he would have been proconsul. That it was already restored at the time of this rescript is evident from

¹ For a parallel to this affair, v. *Polyb.* 38, 3 the insurrection of Critolaus, and for the past relations of Dyme to Rome v. especially *Liv.* xxxii. ch. 21-22.

line 21, since there is no reason for assuming, as Hicks does, that the *δαμοργοι* referred to are the *δαμοργοί* of the late Achaean league. On the other hand 115 B.C. seems rather late in view of the apparently recent reduction of Achaia. On the whole it is most probable that the proconsul is Servilianus.

4. οἱ ἄρχοντες are mentioned with the *σύνεδροι*, in the mystery inscription of Andania, as responsible for the passing of a financial provision (Lebas-Foucart ii. 326a, l. 56-7). Foucart (*Comm.* p. 166) identifies them with the *συναρχαί* which we find at Aegosthena in a federal decree of the Achaean league (*ibid.* No. 12 = *C.I.G.S.* i. 223, v. *Comment.* p. 7) and at Megara (*ibid.* No. 35a = *C.I.G.S.* i. 15), and supposes that they acted as a sort of probouleutic college.

The *σύνεδροι* are found in the Peloponnese at Megalopolis and at Mantinea (Lebas-Foucart, ii. No. 332 and 352g), at Thuria (*ibid.* 303a) and at Andania (*ibid.* 326a).

5. Κυλλάνιον is a person and not the town of Cyllene, as Boeckh and Hicks interpret it. Cf. the ordinary phrase οἱ ἐπὶ τὸν δαίνα. οἱ ἐπὶ K. *σύνεδροι* means either 'the senators under the presidency of K.,' or 'the senators of the party of K.,' that is to say of the party that profited by the new timocratic constitution and the privileges it conferred.

6. ΥΠΕΡ should be read, and not ΠΕΡΙ, though Dittenberger retains the latter in his second edition.

7. ἀρχων for ἀρχεῖον (v. l. 22): a slip of the stone-cutter, cf. l. 1. The ἀρχεῖα were what are elsewhere called τὰ χρῆφυλάκια, i.e. bureaux for the registration and preservation of private contracts. The δημόσια γράμματα were e.g. the registers of the tribute imposed, and of the census. The revolution was consequently not only political, but social as well, an institution of novae tabulae practically.

11. Συμβουλίου and not συνβουλίου should be read. This is the council of the general who organizes a province.

12-16. These lines have exercised the ingenuity of all the editors with varying results.

Hicks' restoration, which is largely based on that of Dobree, is ἐφαίνοντό μοι τῆς χειρίσ-
 της καταστάσεως καὶ ταράχης κατὰπειραν ποιού-
 μενοι, ἢ κολαστρία ἔστιν, οὐ μόνον αἶτε τῆς πρὸς
 M 2

ἀλλήλους οὐσα συναλλαγῆς καὶ χρείας τῆς κατ' δίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ.

Dittenberger reads l. 14 τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους <a> συναλλαγῆς but does not attempt to complete the restoration. Viereck suggests καταβόλην ποιούμενοι τοῖς Ἑλλῆσιν πᾶσιν· οὐ μόνον γὰρ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους <a> συναλλαγῆς καὶ χρείας τῆς κατ' ἰδίαν.

None of these restorations is possible in its entirety. In the first place I read without hesitation at l. 14 ΤΗΣΠΡ... ΛΗΗΛΟΥ. ΑΣΥΝΑΛΛΑ.Τ... ΚΑΙ. The horizontal bar after ασυναλλ. does not appear to be broken, so that it is not part of a Γ. Moreover the letters ΗΣ would not fill the following blank, so that συναλλαγῆς becomes impossible. I suggest ασυναλλαξίας: the word is found in Stob. *Ecl.* ii. p. 320.

In the second place I clearly distinguish \. before ἀλλὰ (l. 15) which can only be the remains of an Α, and would supply οἰκεία or some such word. Finally, adopting (l. 14) a suggestion of M. Foucart χρεωκοπία, I would read the whole as follows: ἐπεὶ... ἐφαίνοντό μοι τῆς χειρίστης καταστάσεως καὶ παραχῆς κατασκευὴν ποιούμενοι τοῖς Ἑλλῆσιν πᾶσιν· οὐ μόνον γὰρ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ασυναλλαξίας καὶ χρεωκοπίας οἰκεία, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀποδοδεμένης κατὰ κοῖνον τοῖς Ἑλλῆσιν ἐλευθερίας ἀλλοτρία.

16. ΕΓ[Ω must be read. There is no trace of the second vertical bar of the Π, though there is room.

21. τῶν δαμιουργῶν refers probably to the

demiurgi of the Achaean league. Cf. *C.I.G.* 1542, l. 13, where a federal decree is dated ἐπὶ δαμιουργῶν—. Cf. Lebas-Foucart ii. 12 = *C.I.G.S.* i. 223.

It is not impossible that they may have been city magistrates of Dyme itself, as distinct from the demiurgi of the league, but in that case we should have expected τοῖς δαμιουργοῖς at l. 4 instead of τοῖς ἄρχουσι, and it is probable that, even had there ever been such magistrates at Dyme, they disappeared with the democracy.

25-6. ἐν[εστῶτος] is impossible as Dittenberger has shown. The word could only refer to the current month, and the phrase τῇ νομηνίᾳ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος in the present context would have no meaning. We must restore τοῦ ἐν[άτου μηνός]. This method of dating is found in other inscriptions of cities of the Achaean league, e.g. Lebas-Foucart, ii. No. 12, μηνὸς τρίτου (a federal decree). Cf. Inscr. recueillies à Delphes, No. 109.

τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων στρατηγῶν, the official rendering of praetor peregrinus.

27. Hicks restores ὅπως ἂν which Viereck, on grammatical grounds, replaces by τὸ δόξ[αν]. The line is too mutilated to decide whether we have the remains of a Σ or of a Ξ.

There is, however, no doubt that Hicks is right in reading Α and not ΑΙ at the end of the line.

T. W. BEASLEY.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

REMINISCENCES OF LUCAN IN ST. AUGUSTINE.

II. 271 nubes excedit Olympus.

The following passage of Augustine is derived from this, *Genes* contra Manich. i. 24m mons .. *Olympus*... tantae altitudinis esse dicitur, ut in eius cacumine nec ventus sentiatur, nec nubes se colligant, quia excedit altitudine sua totum istum aerem humidum cet.

II. 273—pacem magna tenent is quoted by Aug. *gen. ad litt.* iii. 2.

The list of 'Testimonia' in Hosius (and Francken), though very full, is thus incomplete.

II. 331-333.

(Marcia) alios fecunda penates
inpletura datur geminas et sanguine matris
permixtura domos,

suggested Aug. *bon. coniug.* 21 ex. quod Cato dicitur fecisse Romanus, ut traderet uirum uxorem etiam alterius domum filiis impleturam.

A. SOUTER.

* * *

AP. RHOD. III. 161-163.

δοῖα δὲ πόλοι ἀνέχουσι κάρηνα
οὐρέων ἡλιβάτων, κορυφαὶ χθονός, ἥχι τ' ἀερθεῖς
ἥλιος πρώτῃσιν ἐρεῦθετα¹ ἀκτίνεσσιν.

I should like to invite the attention of readers of the *Classical Review* to the above lines. They have been explained in various ways, more or less unsatisfactory.

R. C. S.

* * *

CONFUSION OF solus AND lotus IN LATIN MSS.

I should be very grateful for certain examples of the above confusion, especially from MSS. of prose writers.

J. P. P.

¹ v.l. ἐρεύγεται; Merkel has ἐρεῖθετα.

REVIEWS.

DIMITRIJEVIĆ'S *STUDIA HESIODEA*.

Studia Hesiodæa scripsit Milan R. DIMITRIJEVIĆ. Lipsiæ. B. G. Teubner, 1899. Pp. 1-234.

The author of this admirable treatise, Milan R. Dimitrijević, was born at Belgrade in 1875 and died prematurely at Leipsic in 1897. Though the work of so young a man, the book is the work of a master: not only does it exhibit extensive reading and research, but the skill and power shown in dealing with a peculiarly difficult subject give clear proof of the high quality of the author's mental endowments. By his untimely death classical learning has lost a most promising disciple, and sympathy must also be felt for the bereaved mother, by whose wish this book was published 'pro monumento filii, ne deesset in litteris nostris optimæ spei memoria.'

The title, *Studia Hesiodæa*, is perhaps hardly sufficiently definite: for of the received Hesiodic poems only that which we know by the inadequate title of 'The Works and Days' is here discussed. After enumerating the chief MSS., the most important being Parisinus 2771 (sæc. X/XI) C and Laurentianus XXXI. 39 (sæc. XII) D, supplemented by two Egyptian papyri, the first (A) belonging to the Austrian Archduke Rainer, and already used by Sittl and Kirchhoff for their edition, the second (C) not hitherto used but made known to the writer by favour of Prof. J. Nicole, the author first considers the question whether the poem was known to the ancients in its present form, and claims to have proved from the testimony of ancient poets and commentators that it was so known as far back as the 6th century B.C. It is inferred, perhaps rather too confidently, from a statement in Plutarch (vit. Thes. 20), that Pisistratus established the text with the assistance of either Onomacritus or Cercops, in fact that Pisistratus did for Hesiod just what tradition says he did for Homer. Probably the one statement is as likely as the other. At any rate Pisistratus will serve as a terminus *a quo* in attempting a history of the Hesiodic text. In passing, it may be remarked that many, indeed almost all, editors have supposed that we possess only a portion of a much longer poem, the *Ἔργα Μεγάλα*, mentioned by Pliny. To this belief the author, following Sittl, gives no credit.

Now we come to the main purpose of the book, which is to establish on solid ground the assumption of two ancient recensions. Their relationship can only be ascertained from (1) the remarks of ancient writers, scholia, lexica, &c., and (2) from quotations of the verses of the poem in other ancient authors.

Consequently the scholia are subjected to examination. First comes the commentary of Proclus (A.D. 450) already edited in England by Gaisford from C. It is incomplete, as is proved from quotations in Tzetzes, the Etym. Mag. and other similar evidence. Next come the notes of the Vetus Grammaticus, hitherto anonymous but now identified by the author with Joannes Choeroboscus (A.D. 590). These notes too are proved to be merely excerpts from the original. The two commentators are sharply distinguished and an attempt is made to reconstitute their work by additions from Tzetzes and other sources. The discriminating test is the character of the annotation. If it be philosophical, moral or historical, it goes to Proclus; if grammatical or critical, it is referred to Choeroboscus. The dividing line is certainly clearly drawn, but we may doubt whether it is not after all too rigid. Soon it appears that Proclus drew all his historical and mythical lore from the older commentary of Plutarch, which was his primary source of information: in fact Proclus's work is to a large extent a rechauffé of Plutarch's with a colouring of Platonism. We have now to follow our author in his collection of the remains of Plutarch's commentary with its multifarious learning, its delight in moral interpretation and its disinclination to grammatical criticism. The proof is not always convincing; for it is hardly possible to feel complete confidence in the highly subjective argument, quod universa tractandi ratio redolet ingenium Plutarchæum.

In contrast to Proclus, the notes of Choeroboscus are essentially critical and grammatical. He draws upon the Scholia Vetustissima of the second century A.D., which again in our author's view are probably derived in the main from the writings of Aristonicus (B.C. 30) and Didymus (B.C. 10). Aristonicus wrote a dissertation *περὶ τῶν σημείων τοῦ Ἡσιόδου*, that is, an explanation of the critical marks attached to the edition

of Aristarchus (B.C. 210). Our author is decidedly of opinion against Waeschke and Flach that Aristarchus did not write a commentary on Hesiod. His argument against the evidence which is supposed to establish the opposite view (v. pp. 118 ff.) is strong and convincing. The commentary of Didymus recorded the opinions of Alexandrine critics, particularly those of Aristarchus, but the length of his remarks caused the scholiasts to prefer to make their extracts from the more concise Aristonicus.

Chapter III deals with the quotations by ancient writers, so far as they afford evidence of genuine variants. These are discussed with discrimination and good sense, but it may be well here to mention a few points of difference. In l. 64 Origen's διδασκόμεναι seems entitled to more consideration than our author is inclined to bestow upon it. The vulgate διδασκῆσαι is an atrocity, not in the least degree redeemed by Voss's apparent success in introducing διδασκῆσαι into Hym. Dem. 144. Again I find it necessary to protest against the idea, broached and defended in a long note pp. 172 f., that ἔδωρήσαντ' could stand before πῆμα in l. 82 by apocope. This is a much more serious matter than ἔπος 'φύγεν, the harmless oddity we meet in a well-known edition of Homer. It opens a ready way for the introduction of the most admirable and inextricable confusion into our conception of epic metre. By taking a few more liberties of this kind, e.g. turning ὄνειρ into ὄνειρ with another eminent authority, we should soon be enabled to scan the greater part of Herodotus and Thucydides. In l. 199 the defence of ἴτην against ἴτον is not convincing, nor is ὅς κ' ἔμμορε from Stobaeus in l. 347 a variant of any value. In l. 352 the ἴσα ἄτησι of A is really worth very little as evidence for ἴσ' ἄτησι pace Meineke and Nauck; for the writing ἐκ πλήρους must once have been universal. Still ἴσ' ἄτησι even without MS. support is a true restoration, though a surprisingly bold step for our

author, who rarely goes one jot beyond the tradition. He is essentially conservative and would doubtless have refused to believe that in l. 235:—

τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἑοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσι,

setting aside the dispute between γονεῦσι and τοκεῦσι (D) the real remedy is transposition:—

τίκτουσιν δὲ γονεῦσι ἑοικότα τέκνα γυναῖκες.

To return to the author's conclusions, the testimonia veterum, he observes, are either all for, or all against, the vulgate, never against one another; consequently they, the veteres, must all have used copies of the same edition, which was different from our vulgate. Of this other recension, as our author calls it, we have 52 readings more or less important, in fact nearly all better than those of the vulgate. Again 17 lines of the vulgate were not in this edition, which however had nine lines which the vulgate does not give. Next comes the question, what was the origin of these two recensions. The vulgate was in the hands of many in the first centuries of our era. In the fourth it alone existed. Proclus and Choeroboscus had it: the Alexandrines, i.e. Aristarchus with his contemporaries and predecessors, had it not. Neither had Seleucus or Didymus. Finally, whoever was the author, it must be pronounced a bad piece of work. The other, the earlier and better, recension was probably executed by Aristarchus, who would have for a foundation to work upon the supposed edition of Pisistratus.

The above will serve to indicate the scope of this treatise. It is, as the preface says, opus imperfectum magis quam inchoatum. Its merits are very striking, but can hardly be exhibited here without copious quotation: enough however has been said to prove that the work is one that no conscientious editor of Hesiod's Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι can well afford to neglect.

T. L. AGAR.

PATRICK'S *SEXTUS EMPIRICUS*.

Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism. A Degree Thesis accompanied by a Translation of the First Book of the 'Pyrrhonic Sketches,' by MARY MILLS PATRICK. 8vo. pp. viii, 163 Cambridge, Deighton. 1899. 5s.

THIS little book deserves a hearty welcome as an introduction to the study of Sextus Empiricus. For the historian of philosophy the stores of information which Sextus accumulated respecting the tenets of his dogmatic foes have far more value than his

exposition of the doubting school to which he belonged. But in these matters fortune has a voice. While the writings of the Presocratics have made shipwreck, Sextus, like Seneca and Plotinus, has come down to us almost entire; we must perforce use such materials as we have. Nor is the later Scepticism lacking in interest of its own. Each of the five chapters, of which the work before us consists, suggests some fascinating problem for research. The historical relations of Sextus occupy us first. What was the scene of his activity as a teacher? Has he a claim to the title Empiricus which in *Hyp.* i. 237, 241 he seems to renounce? What was the succession in the Pyrrhonian school, and can it be fixed chronologically? Next the position and aim of Pyrrhonism is discussed. Then come the sceptical tropes in their threefold arrangement, followed by the so-called tropes of Aenesidemus against causality. A further question is raised by an obscure statement attributed to Aenesidemus or his followers (ὁ περὶ τὸν Αἰνισίδημον), viz. that the sceptical movement was a path to the system of Heraclitus. Sextus declares this statement to be absurd. Our author is perhaps seen at her best in the discussion of this question. She first gives a summary of the views previously advanced by Zeller, Pappenheim, Hirzel, Natorp, Brochard and others: views which mainly fall into one or other of two classes. Zeller and Pappenheim agree that Aenesidemus never really changed his sceptical views: hence they have to account for the statement in question, either as a blunder of Sextus, or as an assertion made by followers of Aenesidemus contemporary with Sextus, and not by Aenesidemus himself, then long since dead. The other alternative is to assume some change of view, or at any rate change of expression, in Aenesidemus, sufficient to justify the citation of dogmatic utterances by him in the remarkable form Αἰνισίδημος καθ' Ἡράκλειτον. The writer criticises all these explanations and then goes on to offer her own: viz., that although Aenesidemus was a sceptic and left the Academy when it was abandoning scepticism for eclecticism, and although he remained a sceptic to the end, yet in the two centuries which elapsed between him and Sextus there was a gradual narrowing of the limits of scepticism, so that what Sextus considers his apparent dogmatism might be accounted for by the eclectic spirit of the time and the psychological effect upon himself of formulating sceptical beliefs. 'He remained a Sceptic

as he had always been, but must have grown dogmatic in his attitude towards the sceptical formulae, and was thus able to adopt some of the teachings of Heraclitus, unconscious of their inconsistency' (p. 80). This suggestion deserves to be considered side by side with that of Brochard 'whose solution of the difficulty is on the whole the most logical' (p. 76)—a change of opinion on the part of Aenesidemus. To suppose, with Hirzel and Natorp, that the Heraclitean dogma 'contradictory qualities belong (ὕπάρχει) to the same thing' was understood by Aenesidemus only in the phenomenal sense, so that ὕπάρχει = φαίνεται, is a great strain on our credulity. In the last chapter Pyrrhonism is critically examined. The final judgment may be summed up as follows: 'I think we may safely say that Pyrrhonism was the most consistent system of scepticism ever offered to the world, and yet it proves most decidedly that complete scepticism is psychologically impossible.' This estimate is considerably higher than that which many have passed upon what Mr. A. W. Benn felicitously terms 'the philosophy of the dinner-bell.' And as Dr. Reid has pointed out in his introduction to the *Academics*, two assumptions greatly limit the scope of the ancient, as compared with the modern, discussion upon the bases of human knowledge: one is, that all knowledge comes from experience, and the other, that none of the disputants questions the existence of a real world of things lying behind the phenomena of which we are conscious. It is difficult to avoid confusion in any exposition of the world of phenomena as conceived by the Sceptic. Our author has, we believe, correctly apprehended Sextus, but the various expedients she adopts in translating φαντασία, φαινόμενα, and the like terms, render her statements perplexing to follow. Thus on p. 26 she says: 'Phenomena are the only things which the Sceptic does not deny, and he guides his life by them. They are, however, subjective.' So far, so good: but she continues, 'Sextus distinctly affirms that sensations are the phenomena and that they lie in susceptibility and voluntary [—a misprint for 'involuntary'—] feeling, and that they constitute the appearances of objects,' with references to *Hyp.* i. 22 and *Diog.* ix. 11, 105. But on the same page is cited from *Hyp.* i. 19 [it should be 22]: 'we call the criterion of the Sceptical School the phenomenon, meaning by this name the *idea* of it' (the italics are ours). It is clear that, if practicable, some attempt

should be made to preserve the connexion between *φαινόμενον* and *φαντασία* here (the original is *κριτήριον τοίνυν φαινέν εἶναι τῆς σκεπτικῆς ἀγωγῆς τὸ φαινόμενον, δυνάμει τὴν φαντασίαν αὐτοῦ οὕτω καλοῦντες*). One objection to 'idea' is its ambiguity: again Sextus opposes *φαινόμενα* to *νοούμενα*, objects of sense to objects of thought (§§ 31-33), where our translator rather lamely uses 'the intellectual' in opposition to 'phenomena.' Nor is 'idea' particularly appropriate for *φαντασία* in the first, fourth and fifth tropes (§§ 58, 59, 61, 113, 114, 117, 121, 123). In our opinion there are other terms—appearance, presentation, impression—which, whatever the objections to them, would upon occasion have been preferable to 'idea' as renderings of *φαντασία* in an account of perception.

Of the translation as a whole it may be said that it deserves, quite as much as the original, to be commended for 'beauty and facility of style' (p. 11). It is lively reading and fairly accurate. A few slips have escaped a perhaps hasty revision (to judge by misprints, e.g. *σύγγενος* for *συγγενής*, p. 44, Menedotus, p. 3, 'Thracian' for 'Thasian,' p. 123). The book of Sextus *Πρὸς φυσικούς* should not be described as 'against physics,' nor does *συνάγεσθαι*, § 36, mean 'to take place.' In § 32, *οὐράνια* = the heavenly bodies, and in the same context *κατασκευάζειν*, the technical term for 'establish a positive conclusion, maintain, prove' as opposed to *disprove*, has its force strangely exaggerated. The original *πρὸς τὸν κατασκευάζοντα ὅτι ἔστι πρόνοια ἐκ τῆς τάξεως τῶν οὐρανίων* is rendered 'to the one who from the order of the heavens builds a tower of reasoning to prove that a providence exists.' Again, § 223, 'when (Socrates) performs mental gymnastics,' *ὅταν γυμνάζεται*, is an odd way of alluding to the Platonic dialogues of search. On the other hand the translator now and then strikes out a line of her own with advantage: e.g. § 238, it is a

decided improvement, if the text is sound, to make *ὁ μεθοδικός*, and not *τὰ φύσει ἀλλότρια*, the subject of *ἀναγκάζει*. We append a note on one or two other points. The formula 'Nothing more' (§ 14; cf. 190, 226) is ambiguous and must mislead the English reader. Some extension of it is absolutely demanded by English idiom: not more (this than that), not more so (than the opposite), no more A than not-A. Such an equivalent should at least be appended in a footnote. Similarly Cicero *Acad.* ii. 43, *non eorum qui clament nihilo magis vera illa esse quam falsa*. In § 69 *φησὶ γοῦν αὐτὸν... ἐπιβάλλειν τῷ ἐμπύῳ διὰ πλειόνων ἀναποδείκτων* is rendered [Chrysippus] 'said that the dog follows the fifth of the several non-apodictic syllogisms.' A note referring to *Hyp.* ii. 156 *sqq.* would have been of some service. By the *ἀναπόδεκτα* or *λόγοι ἀναπόδεκτοι*, the Stoics meant much the same as 'immediate inferences,' arguments syllogistic in form which are too obvious to need proof. The example of the fifth kind given ii. 158 has for the major premiss a disjunctive proposition of two members only: 'it is either day or night.' In § 69 it is humorously applied to the case of the dog: 'for when he comes to a meeting of three roads, after seeking the scent in the two roads through which his prey has not passed, he presses forward quickly in the third without scenting it. For the dog reasons in this way; the animal passed though this, or this, or this: it was neither through this nor this, therefore it was through this.' As in the disjunctive proposition which serves as the dog's major premiss there are three clauses, *διὰ πλειόνων* is introduced to distinguish it from the normal disjunctive of two clauses (either A or B). The omission of the article before *διὰ πλειόνων* is unnecessarily harsh and *τῶν* might easily have dropped out after *-τῷ*.

R. D. HICKS.

WILCKEN'S GRIECHISCHE OSTRAKA.

Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien; ein Beitrag zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte, von Dr. ULRICH WILCKEN (Leipzig and Berlin: Giesecke and Devrient, 1899). Pp. xvi. + 860 + 497. 42s.

STUDENTS of the Berlin papyrus-publication have been accustomed to see, in the notes to the texts published by Prof. Ulrich Wilcken of Breslau, references to a work entitled *Griechische Ostraka*, which has now

for some years past been described as 'demnächst erscheinend.' It has now appeared, and proves to be the important work which those who were acquainted with its scheme and with its author expected. The epithet 'epoch-making' is so freely mis-used nowadays that one hesitates to use it here; but this work is, in fact, epoch-making in the true sense of the word. It closes one period of study in the sphere with which it deals, and it opens another. It sums up all that is known in this department of science, and it will form the basis for all future work on this subject.

The importance of the work lies in the fact that it contains far more than its title implies; and to the same cause may partly be attributed the long delay in its appearance. Originally intended merely to be a publication of the Greek texts inscribed on ostraka discovered in Egypt, it has come to include an elaborate survey of the results derivable not only from this source, but also from the papyri which have recently come to light in such vast numbers. Hence the second volume, which contains the texts of 1624 ostraka, is quite outweighed by the first, in which, in an Introduction covering more than 800 pages, Prof. Wilcken gathers together all that is known with regard to the taxation-system of Egypt under the Ptolemies and the Roman empire, together with much subsidiary information upon economical, monetary, and metrological matters. It is a mass of material absolutely essential to any future student of the millennium of Egyptian history between the Macedonian and the Arabian conquests, and of considerable interest to the student of the Roman Empire in general; and it is handled by Prof. Wilcken with the skill and judgment which his former works have led us to expect. It is no small praise to say that the only book with which it can be compared is Lumbroso's admirable *Recherches sur l'économie politique des Lagides*; and in the 30 years since the appearance of Lumbroso's work, the material to be dealt with has increased out of all proportion to the lapse of time.

In the present notice the first volume alone can be taken into consideration. The second contains the texts of the ostraka, which, for most persons, are of importance only as providing the data upon which the conclusions set forth in the Introduction rest; and no examination of them would be profitable without a detailed collation of the originals. A brief summary of the contents of the first volume may be useful. A short

description of the material and appearance of ostraka in general is followed by tables showing the present homes of those included in this collection. Then comes the examination of the contents of these documents; and since the very large majority of them consists of tax-receipts, this resolves itself into an examination of the taxes in force in Egypt in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. The formulae of the texts are first examined and classified (pp. 58-129), the conclusion to which Prof. Wilcken comes (differing from that which he, like others, had previously held with regard to some classes of these receipts) being that most of them are receipts given, not by the tax-farmer to the tax-payer, but by the Government banks to the tax-farmer.¹ Under the rule of the Ptolemies practically all taxes were farmed out; and even under the Roman emperors the same system was largely used, though direct collection by Government officials was also introduced in a great number of instances. The taxes themselves (both in money and in kind) are next examined individually (pp. 130-410), and a formidable list they make. Prof. Wilcken gives no less than 138 heads of taxation as vouched for by the ostraka, and 80 more for which there is evidence from other sources (mainly the papyri); and although not all the headings here given really represent separate taxes (and some of them are not taxes at all), enough remain to justify the statement that there can have been hardly any commodity or occupation in Egypt which did not contribute something to the national revenue. This enumeration occupies the largest section in the book, and may be considered as its *pièce de résistance*; but it is followed by important and elaborate chapters on the methods of tax-farming and tax-raising under the Ptolemies and the Roman governors (pp. 422-629), on the banks and storehouses in which the products of the taxes were received (pp. 630-663), and on the information derived from the ostraka and papyri as to the coinage and the weights and measures in use throughout the period (pp. 718-780).

Such a work, dealing with a mass of details, many of them still beset with much uncertainty, on the one hand lends itself to criticism in many directions, and on the

¹ With regard to a large class of these receipts, however, Prof. Wilcken has already withdrawn this explanation (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, i. 141), definite evidence to the contrary having been furnished by a papyrus in the British Museum; a fact which strikingly illustrates the uncertainty which still surrounds much of the subject.

other renders adequate criticism impossible, within the limits available here, by its very bulk. The only form of criticism, however, which is of practical value in such a case, is for those who are in possession of material bearing on the same subject to make their contribution to the store which Prof. Wilcken has collected, whether in the form of correction or confirmation of his results. Prof. Wilcken has himself shown how usefully this may be done, by his own reviews of previous publications of papyri; and no doubt many students will be ready, within their own limits, to do the same good service to him. This book is not, and does not pretend to be, final. It is the gathering up of all the evidence extant up to a certain date, and as evidence has not ceased to pour in since that date, much that he has written will need to be supplemented and corrected as time goes on. But he has laid the foundations firmly, and if others are able to add something to the superstructure, it will largely be because he has taught them how to use the materials.

As luck would have it, after all the delays caused by the influx of new material, Prof. Wilcken's Introduction finally went to press at a date which just excluded from his view two rather unusually extensive publications of Greco-Egyptian texts, namely the second volumes of the British Museum *Catalogue of Greek Papyri* (1898) and of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (1899). The texts contained in the first-named work were partly known to him in brief provisional descriptions published in 1894, and the originals of many were seen by him during a visit to England in 1895: but these facilities naturally do not compensate for the want of a detailed publication, while the contents of Messrs Grenfell and Hunt's latest volume were, of course, wholly unknown to him. The principal object, therefore, of the following notes is to call attention to points in which these two volumes throw fresh light upon Prof. Wilcken's conclusions.

Pp. 132-3. The tax indicated by the abbreviation $\alpha\epsilon$ is as obscure to me as to Prof. Wilcken; but it is worth observing that in every case the sum named under this head is, as near as possible, $\frac{1}{10}$ of the sum preceding it. There is an apparent exception in Ostr. 1282, but there $\delta\omega$ should probably be read for the doubtful $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$. The only explanation which offers itself is that $\alpha\epsilon = \alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$, meaning that the lower payment was (for some reason unknown) to be substituted for the higher. It

will be observed that when it appears in a statement of several tax-payments, each item after the first is introduced by the word $\delta\mu\omega\iota\omega\varsigma$, but that this is never attached to an entry under the head $\alpha\epsilon$; which seems to indicate that this forms one item with that which precedes it.

P. 137. ff. Wilcken inclines to the view that the fisheries in Egypt were not a Government monopoly; but the high rate of payment required from the fishermen (25 per cent.) points the other way. Such a payment is more akin to the rents paid by a tenant to his landlord than to any ordinary taxation.

P. 146. the $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\acute{\xi}\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ was probably only levied on waggons kept for hire, since it is habitually coupled with the $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\eta\lambda\alpha\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$. The occasional use of the singular $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\xi\eta\varsigma$, in which Wilcken finds a difficulty, is no real objection to this view. Village carriers not unfrequently have only one cart to let on hire.

P. 147 ff. The phrase $\gamma\epsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\upsilon$, as the name of a tax, occurs also in Brit. Mus. Pap. CXCV.; but the term $\gamma\epsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ applies not only to vineyards, but also to orchards and kitchen-gardens, as is shown by its being attached (l. 8) to a total in which these categories of fruit-land are included. It is, in fact, a generic term, denoting land-tax; a very intelligible modification of the natural meaning of the word, since a land-survey was a necessary preliminary to a land-tax.

P. 152. Why should not $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu$, which Wilcken does not undertake to explain, be identical with the $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (p. 154)? The amounts paid are very similar.

P. 162. The tax $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\kappa\upsilon\eta\eta\gamma\omega\upsilon$ is illustrated by B. M. Pap. CCCCLIX, where mention is made of $\delta\eta\mu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\iota\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\upsilon\eta\eta\gamma\omicron\iota$.

P. 172. The term $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (= weaver, not in Liddell and Scott) occurs frequently in the poll-tax list contained in B. M. Pap. CCLVII-CCLIX; and $\gamma\epsilon\rho\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$, the tax levied upon this industry, is repeatedly mentioned in Oxyrhynchus Pap. CCLXXXVIII where the amounts vary between 36 and 40 drachmas per annum.

Pp. 173-176. It seems unnecessary to labour so much the proof that a land-tax, in any well-organised administration, must rest upon a survey, and that therefore it may not unreasonably be denoted by the term $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\gamma\epsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. Clearly this is the case in B. M. Pap. CXCV., mentioned above, where it is coupled with $\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\upsilon$. An exact parallel would be found in the use of $\lambda\alpha\omicron$

γραφία for 'poll-tax.' There is, however, also the possibility that charges *ὑπὲρ γεωμετρίας*, without qualification, may be fees for the re-surveying of land, which, to some extent, was necessary after every inundation. The smallness of the amounts named under this head in the ostraka is in favour of this view. The existence of such annual re-surveys is stated by Herodotus (ii. 109, quoted by Wilcken), and B. M. Pap. DCIV. is an official record of the extent of land (arranged under the names of the owners) inundated in the year 46-7 A.D. A more elaborate example of a land-survey, giving precise measurements, and deducting areas unfitted for cultivation, is contained in B. M. Pap. CCLXVII., where the constantly recurring abbreviation *επιω* recalls the phrase of Herodotus, *ὁ δὲ (Σεσωστρις) ἐπεμπε τοὺς ἐπισκευομένους καὶ ἀναμετρήσοντας*. With these materials a fuller account might now be given of the land-survey system in Egypt than was possible to Wilcken.

P. 182. The existence of the *τέλος ἐγκύκλιον* in Roman times is established by B. M. Pap. CCXCVIb, and Ox. Pap. CCXLII etc.

P. 185. *ἐκφόριον* is the regular term for the portion of the produce of a farm paid as rent by the tenant to the owner. It is found repeatedly in this sense in the papyri, and the formulas of the five ostraka published by Wilcken in which it occurs are entirely in accordance with this interpretation. There is therefore no ground for regarding it as a tax at all.

P. 199 ff. The classification of the taxes, according as they were paid in money or in kind, is useful and important; but the proof of it seems unnecessarily laboured. In many of the cases named, such as the poll-tax, bath-tax, etc., payment in kind was impossible; in many more, such as the taxes on employments, it was either impossible or so improbable as to need little demonstration. It is, in fact, only with regard to the land-tax that the principle is not clear *prima facie*, since (as Wilcken shows), while land bearing wheat, barley, and three varieties of oil paid the tax in kind, land bearing vines, palms, olives, or fruit-trees paid it in money; and kitchen-gardens paid it sometimes in one way, sometimes in the other. Corn was, no doubt, required by the government both for its annual supply of seed-corn to the cultivators, and for export; but it is less clear why oil should have been paid in kind.

P. 226. A contract for the lease of *ἡ γναφική* in two villages of the Fayûm occurs

in B. M. Pap. CCLXXXVI, and is wrongly explained in the *Catalogue* as a lease of the monopoly of laundry-work. The ostrakon published by Wilcken shows that it is rather a lease of the tax on the fulling industry. It would appear, however, from the papyrus that the tax should be placed among the farmed taxes, not among those directly collected, in the list on pp. 575-582.

P. 230 ff. The section on the poll-tax is very important, but it is just here that the new evidence necessitates most modification in Wilcken's view. The question is fully discussed in the British Museum *Catalogue* ii. 17-20, 42-46, 63, and in *Ox. Pap.* ii. 208-214, 217-222, and it is impossible to deal with it at length here. The chief modifications are with regard to the persons liable to the tax. Instead of all males from 14 to 65 and females from 12 to 65 (with the exception of certain privileged classes) being liable, it would appear that the tax was only levied upon males between 14 and 60, and not upon females at all; while a good deal of additional evidence is available with regard to classes wholly or partially exempt (notably the *κάτοικοι* of B. M. Papp. CCLX, CCLXI, and the descendants of gymnasiarchs and the *μυτροπολίται δωδεκάδραχμοι* of Oxyrhynchus). On the other hand, the ostraka supply much evidence as to the rate at which the tax was levied in different parts of Egypt, with the curious result that it differed, not only at different times, but at different places, and even in different districts of a large town, such as Thebes. Apparently it must have been levied for local purposes, like district rates nowadays, and so was subject to local modifications. Wilcken appears (p. 244) to make unnecessary difficulty about the use of the term *λαογραφία* as = 'poll-tax,' and at one time regarded it as merely a payment to cover the expenses of a census. This seems, however, to be putting the cart before the horse. Rulers did not then hold censuses for purely statistical purposes. The numbering of the people was for the purpose of the tax, not *vice versa*. It is important to add, finally, that the evidence derivable from the ostraka is quite consistent with Prof. Ramsay's view that the fourteen-year census was instituted by Augustus about B.C. 10. On this point, however, the latest evidence is that furnished by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt (*loc. cit.*).

P. 256. The word *μερισμός* occurs in a Ptolemaic papyrus (B. M. Pap. CCXXXII.), but apparently not as the name of a tax.

A parallel to the men paying taxes at half the normal rate (p. 256, note 2) may be found in the B. M. poll-tax lists (cf. B. M. Catalogue ii. 53).

P. 259 ff. The ostraka do not clear up the doubts attaching to the word *ναύβιον*, but the gradual accumulation of evidence is slowly leading to more definite results. It is used in two senses, which must be kept apart. In Ptolemaic times it is a measure of cubic content, used in measuring amounts in the excavation of canals or the erection of embankment mounds. Here it is apparently identical with the equally obscure term *άωδιον*. The exact size of the measure is undetermined, but some reason has been shown in B. M. Catalogue ii. 130 for believing it to be a cubic cubit. In Roman times, however, this use of *ναύβιον* disappears, and it becomes simply the name of a tax, levied upon land, and perhaps devoted to the maintenance of the canals and embankments. There are difficulties as to the precise interpretation of the tax (cf. B. M. Cat. ii. 121, *Ox. Pap.* ii. 297), but it would require too much space to discuss them here.

P. 272. There seems no great difficulty in supposing that the same person kept donkeys (and donkey-drivers) for hire, and also carts.

P. 273. *Όρμοφυλακία* may be interpreted on the analogy of *έρμοφυλακία*, as a payment for the protection of merchandise stored at the wharves.

P. 276 ff. The various transit or customs taxes (*πεντηκοστή* *έξαγωγής*, π. *είσαγωγής*, *διαπύλιον*, etc.) need to be treated together. Cf. B. M. Cat. ii. 83-8, Grenfell and Hunt, *Greek Pap.* ii. 78-84.

P. 280. *πλεονασμός* in a technical sense, apparently denoting some form of additional taxation, occurs in two registers of the first century connected with the land tax (B. M. Papp. CXCII, DCIV); but its precise meaning is not clear. One possibility which is worth considering is that it may denote additions to the land held by various individuals due to alterations in the cultivable area caused by the inundation.

P. 310. The pig-tax (*δική*) is abundantly established by the new Oxyrhynchus volume (O.P. CCLXXXVIII, CCLXXXIX etc.).

P. 338. That the abbreviation *επαγ*, occurring in several of the certificates for labour on the embankments, is really a place-name (which Wilcken disputes), is shown by B. M. Pap. CCCXXV b (*έν τῇ Έπαγάθ(ψ) Σοκνοπαίον*, cf. CCCXXV a, *έν τῇ Βουβ(άστψ) Σοκνοπαίον*).

P. 359. On *έρμοφυλακία* (the charge for the safe conduct of merchandise through the desert), cf. B. M. Pap. CCCXVIII (Cat. ii. 87).

P. 378. The annual camel-tax may perhaps have been 10 drachmas; cf. B. M. Cat. ii. 79.

P. 391. Wilcken is here misled by an error in Grenfell and Hunt's *Greek Papyri* ii. 60 (not 55, as misquoted by W.). The papyrus has, not *εγ λ' μ' τρ'*, but simply *εγλημπτορ'*, i.e. *εγλήμπτορος*. This correction was already made in *Class. Rev.* xi. 97, and Wilcken might have been saved some superfluous conjectures if he had seen it.

P. 384. On the *τέλος μόσχου θωμένον*, see B. M. Pap. CCCCLXXII.

P. 394 note. The true reading in Grenfell and Hunt's *Greek Pap.* ii. 58 is *έρμοφυλακίας Προσωπίτων και [Αγροπολίτων]* as appears from B. M. Papp. CCCXVIII, CCCXXX, not *'Αρσινόιτων*, as Wilcken conjectures. This also was stated in *Class. Rev.* xi. 97.

P. 431 note 1. The date of the document referred to by Wilcken (B. M. Pap. CCCXLVIII) is apparently A.D. 202-3, not 205-6. If Wilcken is right in fixing A.D. 202 as the date of the first establishment of a *βουλή* in Arsinoë, the *βουλευτής* here mentioned must have been one of the original members.

P. 432. *άμφοδον* apparently denotes a district, like *λαίρα*, rather than a street (*ρόμη*); cf. *Ox. Pap.* ii. 189.

P. 438. The list of censuses here given can be increased from *Ox. Pap.* ii. 209 ff., where the direct evidence of the fourteen-year cycle is carried back to A.D. 19-20.

P. 448. Wilcken apparently still holds the view that *έπίκρισις* was a purely military function. As against this, see B. M. Cat. ii. 42-46, and *Ox. Pap.* ii. 217-222. The new evidence furnished by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt entirely supports the view expressed in the B. M. Catalogue that, in addition to the purely military *έπίκρισις* there was also an *έπίκρισις* by which youths were, at the proper time, admitted to the privileged class which was exempt from the poll-tax.

Pp. 453-4. Notification of the births of girls were not made in the *υπομήματα ένγεννήσεως*, because girls were not subject to the poll-tax (see above).

P. 455. The British Museum has four examples of death-certificates (cf. Cat. ii. 65-68), not only one.

P. 464. There is no proof that the returns of real property (land, houses, etc.) were made annually, and probability is against

it; cf. Grenfell and Hunt's full discussion of the point in *Ox. Pap.* ii. 177-179.

P. 480. An example of a land-survey book is preserved in B. M. Pap. CCLXVII.

P. 483. Not only the survey-books, but also the census registers were available for reference by the general public; cf. B. M. Pap. CCCXXIV (the document somewhat hesitatingly quoted by Wilcken on p. 487).

P. 505. The order of Ti. Julius Alexander, that the land-tax should be levied each year with reference to the extent of land actually inundated in that year, is illustrated by B. M. Pap. DCIV, which is a register of the land inundated in A.D. 46-7, twenty years earlier than Alexander's edict.

P. 607, note 1. Wilcken's note on B. M. Pap. CCCVI, which rests on a misunderstanding of the description in the B. M. *Catalogue of Additions*, is obviated by the complete publication of the text in the *Catalogue of Papyri*, the readings of which (l. 19 *σιτοῖον* (1), l. 23 *αὐτῷ δ*) differ slightly from those of Wilcken.

Pp. 653-4. On the *σιτολόγοι* cf. B. M. *Cat.* ii. 88, 89, 95, where much the same conclusions are arrived at as here.

P. 657, note 2. On the phrase *γῆ προσόδου* cf. B. M. *Cat.* ii. 96. The parallels quoted there seem to make it almost certain that *γῆ προσόδου* = *γῆ ιδιωτική*. Wilcken objects that the land in question was apparently cultivated by *δημόσιοι γεωργοί*, but we do not know that this term was limited to the cultivators of the royal domain-land. It may have applied to all who received advances of seed-corn from the state. In any case it seems impossible to believe that the classifications of land as *βασιλική, ιερά, and ιδιωτική* of B. M. Pap. DCIV, *βασιλική, ιερά, and ἐτέρα* of B. M. Pap. CCLVI, and *βασιλική, ιερά, and προσόδου* of Berl. Pap. 20, are not identical.

P. 662. The interpretation of the name *Φαῦστος Πρίσκος Καίσαρος* in the B. M. *Cat. of Additions* has already been corrected in the *Catalogue of Papyri*, ii. 96.

P. 667. The rate of equivalence, 2 artabas of barley = 1 artaba of wheat, must not be taken as constant. In another of the Petrie papyri Mr. Smyly has found the ratio, 5 artabas of barley = 3 artabas of wheat.

P. 723. On the relation between silver and copper, see Grenfell and Hunt, *Ox. Pap.* ii. 188, where an explanation is given of the ratio 1 : 450 which Wilcken finds in the ostraka, and of the ratio 1 : 500 which appears in B. M. Pap. CCLXVI.

Pp. 732-3. It is noteworthy that Wilcken

withdraws the imaginary 'hexobol' coins which he believed he had discovered in B. M. Pap. CXXXI, the true reading being (as in the printed text of that papyrus) *ἐξ ὀβολῶν*. The references to Pap. CXXXI in the notes should be to ll. 529 and 530 and (p. 733, note 2) 339.

P. 741 ff. With regard to the artaba, there is much new matter to be incorporated from B. M. Pap. CCLXV, and the whole subject requires re-examination by a professed metrologist. We have (1) artabas of several different sizes vouched for by the ostraka and papyri and the ancient metrological authorities; (2) three artabas, whose relative proportions are known, but not their exact size, vouched for by B. M. Pap. CXXV; (3) six artabas, of which similarly only the relative proportions are known, vouched for by B. M. Pap. CCLXV. Hultsch and Wilcken have made some progress in correlating Nos. 1 and 2; but No. 3 introduces a large disturbing element, too extensive to examine here. Cf. B. M. *Cat.* ii. 257 ff.

P. 742. For Revillont's mis-reading, and consequent misinterpretation, of Petrie, Pap. II. 25 (b), cf. B. M. *Cat.* ii. p. xv.

P. 744. An artaba of 48 choinices in Roman times seems to be established by B. M. Pap. CXCHII, but the data of that document are somewhat conflicting, some of the entries seeming to point rather to an artaba of 36 choinices. In any case the *διχοίνικον* appears to be a payment of two choinices on the aroma of land, not on the artaba of wheat as stated in *Cat.* ii. 121 (cf. l. 5 of that papyrus).

P. 750. On the smaller measures, the *τέταρτον, ἕκτον*, etc., cf. also B. M. *Cat.* ii. p. xv.

P. 751. Wilcken's notification of a measure named *μάτιον*, as occurring in the ostraka, explains a difficulty in B. M. Pap. CCCCXXVIII, where the word appears in an abbreviated form, and apparently interchanged with *μέτρον*. Its size here appears to be $\frac{1}{18}$ of an artaba. Brugsch, according to Wilcken, has calculated it at $\frac{1}{12}$; but we do not know what artaba is used in either case.

P. 755. *ζεύγος* as a measure (merely = 'a pair') occurs not only in B. M. Pap. XIV., but also in Papp. CX, CCCCXXIX.

P. 761. Wilcken's correction of the view that a *κεράμιον* = $\frac{1}{2}$ *μετρητής* deserves especial notice. For this must be substituted Brugsch's equation, 1 *κεράμιον* = $\frac{2}{3}$ *μετρητής* = 8 *χόες*.

P. 763. The symbol for *ξίστης* (a ξ with

an oblique line drawn through it) occurs also in B.M. Pap. CCLII, of the fourth century.

P. 766. *κούφα*, in the sense of casks, occurs in B.M. Pap. CCCXC.

P. 771. On the *μέτρον δρόμῳ τετραχόινικον* see B.M. *Cat.* pp. xv. 257 ff. According to the British Museum papyri, *δρόμῳ* is the right reading, not *δρόμου* or *δρόμων*. The fact that the *δρόμος-artaba* has as its subdivision a *μέτρον τετραχόινικον* is in favour of the identification of that artaba with the 40-choinix artaba, which also harmonises with the fact that the *δρόμος-artaba* is the largest of the six named in Pap. CCLXV. (N.B.—The interpretation of *μέτρον ξεστόν* in B.M. *Cat.* ii. p. xv., as a measure containing one *ξέστης*, must be withdrawn.)

P. 810. The identification of the month *Σωτήριος* as = Pauni is established by B.M. Pap. CXLI (previously published in *Palaeog. Soc.* ii. 146). The identification of *Νερόννεος Σεβαστός* as = Pharmouthi rested on the fact that Nero gave his name to the month April (Suet. *Ner.* 55, Tac. *Ann.* xii. 16); but as

an ostrakon shows (if the reading is correct) that the name was in use under Claudius, the ground of this identification is cut away.

P. 811. Another month-name should be added to the list, viz. *Δομυτιανός*, apparently equivalent to Phaophi (B.M. Pap. CCLIX, l. 99).

P. 813. The use of the name *Ἰουλία Σεβαστή* as the title of a special day is established against Wilcken's suspicions by *Ox. Pap.* ii. CCLXXXIII, *τῇ αἷ Ἰουλίᾳ Σεβαστῇ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος μηνός*.

It is to be feared that these details have proved long and tedious, although they have left many points of controversy and interest indicated rather than discussed. But the best tribute to so useful and important a book is to try, in one's own way, to render its accuracy yet more accurate; and it is in a spirit of admiration, and not in the least of detraction, that these criticisms are offered.

F. G. KENYON.

TYRRELL AND PURSER'S CORRESPONDENCE OF CICERO.

The Correspondence of Cicero, edited by R. Y. TYRRELL and L. C. PURSER. Vol. VI. Dublin University Press Series. Dublin and London, 1899. Pp. cxvii, 347.

The sixth volume of Messrs Tyrrell and Purser's great edition completes the correspondence of Cicero and the editors promise the final volume containing the index at an early date. They are to be congratulated upon the successful termination of their arduous task. In their modest Preface they speak apologetically of the time which they have taken and hint that they might have worked more rapidly, if all their leisure had been given to their work. It is, however, difficult to conceive greater rapidity of production than that which has attended their efforts of late, volumes IV., V., and VI. having been published in a space of five years. It is noteworthy that this rapidity has not been attended by any falling off in quality. On the contrary the later volumes are fuller and more thorough both in plan and in execution than the earlier ones.

The Introduction to Vol. VI. consists of three parts, viz. (i) Cicero at the head of

the State, (ii) Cicero's correspondents, (iii) the correspondence with M. Brutus. The first of these is a sympathetic sketch of the services rendered by Cicero to his country in the last struggle against despotism, and is a most valuable source of information for the history of the period. The correspondents of Cicero whom the editors portray in their well-known manner are Plancus, D. Brutus, Pollio, P. Lentulus Spinther, Furnius, Cassius, and M. Brutus. It seems odd that Lepidus is not included in the list, considering the important rôle which he played, while we could have spared the brief sketches of Lentulus Spinther and Furnius, who are but minor characters. The editors have drawn largely from various learned works, particularly in the case of Plancus from the 'charming monograph' of M. Jullien (Le fondateur de Lyon), and in that of M. Brutus from a pamphlet of O. E. Schmidt, whose unfavourable estimate they adopt. They also acknowledge their obligations to various dissertations upon the style of various writers, e.g. to Schmalz upon the language of Pollio, to Köhler on that of Lentulus, to Hellmuth on that of Galba, to Rhodius and Gitlbauer on the letters of Plancus. The

sketch of Plancus is full of subtle insight into the character of this favourite of fortune, the *morbo proditor* of Velleius. The editors quote many valuable remarks from M. Jullien, e.g. p. xli., when speaking of the letter written in March 23, in which Plancus, who previously had maintained a consistent reserve, declares for the Republic, they say 'What was the real cause of this sudden alteration of the views of Plancus? It was, as M. Jullien acutely sees, the demand of Antony to be given Gallia Comata in exchange for Cisalpine Gaul. Plancus had been, as the saying is, "sitting on the hedge," but now that one of the parties interferes vitally with his interests, he takes a side.' With one view which the editors adopt silently from M. Jullien I find myself unable to agree. This in connection with the foundation of the colony of Lugdunum by Plancus and Lepidus, which they assign to June 23, after the junction of Lepidus with Antony on May 29 and before June 30, when Lepidus was declared a *hostis*. They say (p. lxxi.) that 'the Senate during June were at their wits' end to know how to treat Lepidus. Their chief aim was to keep him from immediately marching into Italy. Accordingly, they gave him orders to join with Plancus in founding the colony.' As this is very conjectural, it would have been well to quote the arguments upon which Jullien bases his hypothesis. Our authority is Dio Cassius, who (xlv. 50) assigns the foundation of Lugdunum to the period between the relief of Mutina, and the junction of Lepidus with Antony, i.e. between April 21 and May 29, the object of the Senate being to prevent the coalition of Lepidus and Antony. The date given by Dio is impossible in view of the letters of Plancus written at this time, and so Jullien proposes the theory above-mentioned. I cannot think it credible that the Senate would confer this task on Lepidus after his defection, especially in view of the danger that the troops of Plancus and D. Brutus, who was then with Plancus, might fraternise with those of Lepidus and Antonius. I would prefer to suppose that the order was given to Plancus while his attitude was still dubious, i.e. before March or April, in order to keep him employed. The association of Lepidus with Plancus in this task is contradicted by all other evidence, and is probably due to an error on the part of Dio.

The essay upon M. Brutus is the longest of the seven. In it the editors quote largely from O. E. Schmidt, many of whose

criticisms are admirable, e.g. p. xcvi. on the interest which both the friends and the enemies of Brutus had in spreading the rumour that he was the son of Caesar, or p. 261 on the conclusion of Cicero's letter to Brutus, where they remark that 'Schmidt has done more than anyone else to put the characters of Cicero and Brutus in their true light.' The editors (p. c.) go so far as to agree with Dante, who in the *Inferno* places Brutus in the jaws of Satan, though on another occasion (p. cx. n.) they allow him the 'good qualities of his faults.' I do not feel that he receives full justice at the hands of his critics. A special point urged against him is that he treated with clemency his prisoner, C. Antonius, allowing him to use the title Proconsul in a letter to the Senate. This is ascribed to treachery on his part, and a wish to make friends with the Antonians (p. xlv.). Surely this is rather hard. Brutus was at all times averse to blood-spilling, and, apart from such considerations, it was a wise policy not to set the example of putting prisoners to death, in view of the fact that D. Brutus was himself besieged in Mutina. C. Antonius was a hostage for the safety of D. Brutus. Dio Cassius tells us that after the death of D. Brutus, the interest of Brutus in his prisoner ceased (xlvii. 24. 4). Further, Brutus, like other Roman nobles, was greatly influenced by family ties, and held that much might be excused in a connection. He blames Cicero for his passionate attacks on Antony, and intercedes on behalf of Lepidus, just as Metellus Celer had intervened in 62 on behalf of Metellus Nepos, and as the nobles petted Clodius in the Senate. Brutus could not forget that Lepidus was his brother-in-law, and that his nephew, the son of Lepidus, was married to the daughter of Antony. Such considerations would appeal even more strongly to women, and it is clear from these letters that Brutus was ruled by women, and especially by his mother Servilia, the great lady who was able to have a clause removed from a *senatus consultum* (Att. xv. 11. 2). Servilia, Porcia and Tertulla form a Cabinet of ladies, who direct the movements and the actions of Brutus. It is, therefore, not surprising that his policy should appear emotional and inconsistent.

The editors show great judgment in dealing with the vexed question of the letters to Brutus. They consider them all genuine with the possible exception of l. 16 and 17, though they argue very strongly in favour of the genuineness of these also.

They thus occupy a midway position between C. F. W. Müller who says briefly '*Brutinas epistulas credo veras esse omnes, etiam XVI. et XVII.*' and Gurlitt, who, although the champion of the other letters, thinks that 1. 16 and 17 are *Suasoriae* of a later age, though in the case of 1. 17 he thinks § 7 a genuine fragment to which a forgery has been attached. The arguments of the editors in favour of the general authenticity of these letters are to my mind wholly convincing. I find it difficult to understand how anyone ever could have suspected such a letter as I. 8, in which Cicero briefly commends to Brutus a certain C. Nasennius of Suessa who had been a centurion under Metellus Creticus, while several others e.g. 1. 5, 1. 6, 1. 11 are full of detail, and very unlike the work of a forger. The two letters 1.16 and 17 in which Brutus rates Cicero for truckling to Octavian differ from the others in that they contain topics which would naturally present themselves to a forger. This, however, does not prove that they are forgeries. The editors admirably remark (p. 153) 'It is possible that the letters may be the composition of a rhetorician; but it is by no means impossible that they may have been the work of the narrow-minded, stiff, and ungracious Brutus. With regard to the poverty of thought displayed in this letter and the following, we think that a mark of genuineness. When a feeble man gives way to irritability he is generally verbose: and at this time Brutus in his relations with Cicero was dominated by one single ground of complaint, and he urges that complaint in every possible and conceivable way.' This is excellent criticism, and a fair specimen of the notes upon these two letters.

The letters contained in vol. vi. are 114 in number, of which only 11 are written to Atticus. It necessarily follows that in brightness and interest they are inferior to many of those contained in previous volumes. The lighter side of Cicero's correspondence is however represented by a charming letter to Paetus (820), while letters of conspicuous interest are 815, in which Quintus Cicero, characteristically choosing the freedman Tiro for his confidences, writes with his usual *abandon* and indiscretion concerning the past record of Hirtius and Pansa; 877 in which D. Brutus informs Cicero of the story which was in circulation concerning his fatal *mot* regarding young Octavian (*laudandum adolescentem, ornandum, tollendum*), and 896 in

which Pollio tells of the 'fantastic tricks' performed by Balbus, then quaestor at Gades, who, modelling himself upon Caesar, made an actor an *eques*, continued his office of *quattuorvir* for another year after the pattern of Caesar's dictatorship, and appointed magistrates for two years in advance, while, unlike Caesar, he showed savage cruelty in burning alive in the forum an old soldier of Pompeius, and exposing Roman citizens to wild beasts. Most of the letters, however, are melancholy reading. Cicero is struggling hard to organise the republicans, but everywhere has to deal with men who, if not traitors at heart, are blind to all but their immediate advantage. Plancus wishes to step at once into the shoes of Hirtius (862), D. Brutus resents the fact that he was not made one of the decemvirs for the distribution of land to the soldiers (877. 1), Furnius wishes to leave Gaul in order to stand for the praetorship (907). Pollio confesses that he could have done more, if more notice had been taken of him (896. 5), while even young Marcus wants to come home in order to obtain a priesthood (913. 1). With infinite dexterity and patience Cicero brings to bear upon each one the influence most likely to induce him to remain loyal to the party, and above all to remain at the front.

In the usual *Conspectus* at the beginning of the volume the editors give one passage (807. 6) where they successfully defend the reading of the MSS. *quisquam* against the conjecture *quicquam* generally adopted, and two where with great probability they adopt the reading of H Pal., viz. 806. 2. sed H Pal. (and Erf.): sed si M; sed st *vulg.*, 861. 3. nimisque H Pal., miisque M, in *eisque vulg.* They record 13 conjectures of their own, one of which, however, appears to be wrongly included, since in their note on the passage (864. 2) it is ascribed to Cobet. The other cases are 799. 1. †asta] a Septimia (ab ista Boot).

ib. sine †vallo Luciliano] sine φραγμαῖ Luciliano, on the analogy of πεφραγμένως λέγαν. This is highly ingenious. The editors do not mention Gurlitt's brilliant conjecture (published in 1898, when possibly their work was already in print) *sine φάλλῳ Luciliano*. The difficulty which I feel about φραγμαῖ is that Lucilius did not hide his meaning, or beat about the bush (Juvenal 1. 165, Persius .1. 115). An unpublished conjecture of Turnebus, which I recently met with, is worth mentioning here, viz. *sine alio*, i.e. 'the plebeian flavour of Lucilius,' for which may be quoted Varro

(ap. Nonium 201. 6), atavi nostri cum allium ac saepe eorum verba olerent, tamen optime animati erant.

837. 5. The editors add <ab ipso senatu> as having dropped out after *in senatu*. The context seems to require something like *vereor ne possit altera*, or *non potest altera*.

844. 1. consules <esse>. The insertion seems almost necessary, and the corruption is very simple (viz. *es* is omitted after *es*).

ib. usque in Capitolium deductus maximo clamore atque plausu in rostris collocatus sum]. As this seems to imply that the rostra were on the Capitol, the editors conjecture <et postea reductus> after *deductus*. It is possible that *mox* may have dropped out before *maximo*.

850. 2. <sed> statuit sibi eundum <domum>. The addition of *sed* is highly probable. For the second the editors say 'we have added *domum*, which can easily have been lost after *eundum*.' This is quite true but *eundum* rests on very weak authority, viz. *Pal.*³ The reading of M is *statuit id sibi*. Gurlitt says '*excidit non licere*.' Possibly *statuit* haud sibi <licere>.

864. 5. vivere <per se> et pecunias habere . . . volumus. The addition distinctly improves the sense.

865. 5. liceat ergo patrem appellet Ciceronem. referat omnia <ad Ciceronem>, laudet. As Brutus is the writer, elegance can hardly be expected.

866. 3. neu semper primi cuiusque mali excidendi causa sit, ut aliud renascatur illo peius. The editors suggest that *ea* should be inserted after *causa*, 'which might easily have dropped out before the abbreviation *ca*.' This is on palaeographical grounds most ingenious and attractive, but I have some difficulty in construing the passage.

874. 3. seditione quae facta est in legione quarta de Catoniis—in bonam partem accipies—magis mihi probatur militum severitas quam tua]. So the MSS. *Quarta* is corrupt, since that legion was elsewhere. The editors who accept Hermann's *fraude C. Antonii* for *de Catoniis*, suggest either that *quarta* arose from 'a misunderstanding of *LEGIONIV*' in uncials (V for B as often), a clever suggestion, or that it stands for *capta*, less probably. With Wesenberg they add <clementia> after *tua*, and refer to intrigues of C. Antonius with the troops of Brutus. I would suggest that the soldiers of Brutus had attempted to lynch partisans of Antonius, and that Brutus had suppressed them with severity. The simplest correction of *de Catoniis* is *de Antoni*.
NO. CXXII. VOL. XIV.

anis. In a letter of Brutus (837. 2) he says of C. Antonius 'et moveor hominis precibus et timeo ne illum aliquorum furor excipiat.' The editors remark on *excipiat* "carry off," a slightly unusual meaning.' I do not find any parallel for *excipere* in the sense of 'rescue,' and if this is the sense, would conjecture *eripiat* (Cf. Dio. Cass. xlvii. 23 *ὅπως ἐξαπείσωσιν αὐτὸν*). I would suggest that it means 'cut off,' i.e. kill, and that Brutus feared that his soldiers would take the law into their own hands.

913. 1. Domitii, Catonis, Lentuli, Bibulorum. In the Conspectus the editors suggest *Bibuli, aliorum*, a very good suggestion which deserves to be mentioned under the text.

914. 9. ne magis videor providus fuisse, quam gratus. [hoc ipsum nimium]. In the words bracketed the editors recognise the addition of a reader who thought Cicero's statement too highly coloured. This is very attractive. Cf. 819. 2. where a glossator adds in the margin of M *sile obsecro*.

The editors omit to place in this list three conjectures which they print in the text, viz. 842. 4. causae <tamen> non default: 864. 5. <id> non concesserim: 897. 3. nemo alio <in> magistratu, the last of which seems necessary. Their modesty also leads them to assign a place to conjectures of other scholars in preference to good suggestions of their own, e.g. 813. 3. haud frequens, (aut frequens MSS. haud infrequens vulg.) 843. scribis me e maximo otio exisse (scribis me maximo otio egisse MSS.) 906. 2. quoi ego certe favissem (qui ego certe fuissem MSS.).

It is sometimes hard to see on what principle readings are included in this Conspectus or excluded from it, e.g. 869. 1. Madvig's 'fine emendation' *equitum milia quinque* (*equitum M. itaque H. Pal. : equitum itaque M*) is placed in the Conspectus though printed both by Mendelssohn and Müller, while 842. 3. *Celer Pilius*, the 'brilliant emendation of Ruete' made in 1883, and since then printed by Müller, does not appear. Also, while omitting from the Conspectus readings of which they express approval under the text or in the *Adnotatio Critica* e.g. 789. 2. *statutum habeo esse* Müll. '*luculente*' (*statuo habere esse M*), 797. *qui quidem Boot*: *quique MSS.*, 'which cannot be right,' 915. 5. *obsurdescunt Manutius* (*obdurescunt MSS*), 916. 1. *mutua Klotz* 'very cleverly' (in *tua MSS*), they include conjectures of which they say nothing, or express disapproval,

under the text, e.g. 808. 4. cura *Rhodium* (sum *MSS*), 826. 3. inita *Kleyn* (ea *MSS*)

I note the following discrepancies:

805. 3. quadret (caderet *MSS*.) is called under the text, 'the conjecture of Boot and C. W. F. Müller,' in the Adnotatio Critica it is assigned to Müller only. It is true that Wesenberg attributes it to Müller, but Boot says *correci*, and Müller, who prints it silently, does not claim the emendation.

841. 1. The editors learnedly defend *potuisse* (so *MSS*.) against *potis essemus*, the conjecture of Hellmuth, which, however, appears in the Conspectus as a reading 'recorded with approbation.'

864. 5. Under the text we find, 'most *MSS*. omit *ab aliis*, see Adn. Crit.' On turning to the Adn. Crit. the only note which I find is, 'de hoc loco in Commentario disputavimus.'

In spite of their well-known skill as textual critics, the editors are excessively conservative, e.g. 828. 2, they merely speak well of, but do not print, the conjecture of Manutius (revived by Mendelssohn) [xx], i.e. 2,000,000 sesterces (xx *MSS*. i.e. 20,000), though it can hardly be supposed that Cornificius was seriously embarrassed, if the Senate did not vote him £180, and 916. 6 they print 'quod exercitus [habent] non contemnendos habent,' remarking '*habent* in textum ex proximo irrepsit.' In this they follow Mendelssohn, the most conservative of critics, but I fail to see why so indisputable an addition should be allowed to survive within brackets and thus deface the text.

The notes throughout reach the high standard previously set up by the editors. Those upon the chronology are particularly admirable and represent a vast amount of labour, not only on the part of other scholars, especially Schmidt and Gurlitt, but also of the editors, who on every point have brought to bear their fresh and unprejudiced judgment. Among the most excellent may be mentioned those on the date of 809 and 859, and generally the notes upon 864, the letter of Brutus round which so much controversy has raged. The comments of the editors are enlivened by witty phrases and happy translations, such as we expect from them.

I add a few remarks which struck me while reading the volume. 787. 2. *magnae cum diligentiae est <tuaeque curae>* tum etiam fortunae. The editors add *tuaeque curae* from H, om. M Pal. The position of *tuae* seems awkward, while the omission of the words from Pal., which Gurlitt has

shown to have been copied from the Lorsch MS. used by Cratander, shows that the addition in H has not the undivided support of the Transalpine family. For the same reason I should hesitate to read with the editors from H in 854. 2 *quantam cupiditatem hominibus <honoris> inicit vacuitas*, om. honoris M Pal. These passages differ from e.g. 790. 2, 883. 3, 895. 3, where they rightly admit from H Pal. passages omitted by M.

801. 2. The editors print *ensoribus* in italics, with the note 'this word must be supplied.' Not only, however, is it inserted by Cratander, who took readings first printed by himself from a MS. (Lehmann p. 71), but is quoted by Lambinus from his v. c. (i.e. Z). On the other hand they print in ordinary type 805. 3, *imperatoris officium*, an addition which has identically the same authority.

807. 2. *agi prorsus vehementer et severe volo*. From this passage I would read in Att. 1. 13. 3. *vehementer adhuc agit <et> severe* (om. et, *MSS*. add.)

ib. 5. *res familiaris movet, rem dico?* The editors approve of Boot's conjecture *res dico*, saying that 'it is Cicero's custom to preserve the exact case and form of the word reflected.' This hardly covers e.g. Phil. ii. 67. *Charybdis...Charybdis dico?* xiv. 22. *decreta est: decretam dico?*

821. 2. *belli omne discrimen in D. Bruto positum...qui si...erupisset Mutina nihil belli reliqui fore videbatur MSS*: all editors write *belli reliquum* with Lambinus. I would suggest that *belli* is dittography of *reliqui*. For the confusion cf. Phil. xiii. 3. *reliquorum V: belli quorum D*.

841. 4. *delevit fugavit eodemque loco ubi erat pugnatum*. The editors quote Wölflin who says that 'it is more glorious to defeat the enemy on the original battlefield than in a subsequent engagement elsewhere,' which seems fanciful. Some early editors read *fugavitque eodem*, which is a very simple correction.

ib. 5. *Hirtius in ea castra redit, unde Pansa exierat*. The editors say that *redit* is a historical present coupled with a past tense. In *MSS*, however, *redit* is frequently written for *rediit*, which is restored by editors, e.g. Phil. xiii 17: cf. Att. 1. 14. 7. *redii* Madvig: *redi MSS*.

864. 1. *Particulam litterarum tuarum*. I prefer *litterularum* the reading of the v. c. Cratandri (C). Brutus expresses his spleen by the two diminutives.

882. 3. *Rhodium autem tanta in pravitate animadverti*. The editors remark that the

in is curious. The omission of *esse* seems more so. Possibly in *pravitate esse* should be read, *esse* (i.e. *ēē*) having dropped out after *-te*.

ib. 5. (Rhodii)...nullo exemplo neque nostra ex parte <provocati> neque nostro praesentium neque imminenti Italiae urbiue nostrae periculo...mederi...voluerunt]. *Provocati* is an addition of Wesenberg, while *voluerunt* is only read by some inferior MSS. (*noluerunt* M). The sentence is very awkward in spite of these changes, as will be seen from the paraphrase given by the editors, who make the apodosis begin with *neque nostro praesentium* etc. It would be simpler to remove *neque* before *nostro*, as introduced from the preceding *neque*, and otherwise to read with M, viz. nullo exemplo neque nostra ex parte neque nostro praesentium imminenti Italiae...periculo...mederi... noluerunt, i.e. 'without any provocation from our party or myself here present, they have refused to help in averting the danger' etc.

ib. 6. Pecuniam ... cogam omnibusque rationibus ad vos mittam]. The editors say that 'inferior MSS. read *omnibus cum rationibus*.' Old editors print silently *omnibusque cum rationibus*, as I think rightly (Of. Mendelssohn 'est sane mirus nudus ablativus,') but I cannot find any MS. authority for *cum*.

896. 3. depressus in ludum bis gratis depugnasset]. The editors render 'compelled to join the gladiators' school.' Possibly *deprehensus* should be read for *depressus*, in ludum being an ungrammatical addition from the context.

900. This letter used to form part of 859 (Fam. xi. 13), a letter of D. Brutus. Gurlitt acutely saw that it is a despatch of Plancus and D. Brutus to the Senate after they had joined forces, an important event alluded to elsewhere (905, 913. 2, 916. 4). It would be well to add a reference to Gurlitt's dissertation.

910. tecum enim illum [et te] in Italiam celeriter esse venturum confido]. The editors suggest that *et te* is a gloss on *tecum*. Possibly it is a senseless variant for *esse*, which after being relegated to the margin, has been inserted in the wrong place.

914. 1. se exercuit in verissimo genere dicendi]. Perhaps *severissimo* should be read cf. Brut. 113. severum genus dicendi, Quintil. x. 1. 131 severiore genere satis firmatis legendus. The reference to Brut. 23 'qui eloquentiae verae dat operam' is hardly a sufficient parallel.

ib. 5. Italiae sua studia profitenti remi-

sistis]. The editors translate 'declined to use.' Possibly, *renuntiavistis*, 'you said farewell to,' cf. Seneca, Nat. Q. vi. 1. 10 Campaniae renuntiavere, Quintil. x. 7. 1. civilibus officiis renuntiabit.

The spelling used in the volume is not always consistent, e.g. 901. 4. we find *Laudiceam* (so H, Pal., *Laodiceam* M) but 891. 7, *Laodicea* (so M, *Laudicea* H. Pal.). The evidence seems the same in each case. In 915. 4. we find *gerundis*, though *-endus* is generally adopted. In 901. 3. *civitatium* but 914. 11. *civitatum* (Neue ¹², p. 266 prefers *civitatium*). A note seems required on the rare form *scii* used by Plancus (808. 1).

I have noted the following misprints which are not rectified in the list of *Errata*, p. xxxv. note, for Caelius, read Calenus; letter 814. 2 for *nemini*, read *memini*; 860. 3 in the text *et* has been accidentally omitted before *ab re publica*; 870. 2 in the note upon *exercitu*, for 'they fell out in H,' read 'they fell out in M'; 900, in the note upon the date, for 869, read 859: Frag. Epp. ad. C. Caesarem I. iii. for *radito*, read *tradito*; 914. 4 for *consentiens*, *nos* read *consentiens—nos*. In 882. 1. I prefer the punctuation of Müller *novarum, maximeque* to that of the editors, *novarum. Maximeque*.

Now that the task of the Dublin editors is so nearly completed, one may be permitted shortly to summarise their services towards the study of Cicero's Letters. They have given us the correspondence chronologically arranged with Historical Introductions and sketches of the leading men which are remarkable for learning, sobriety of judgment and lightness of touch. The notes combine in a succinct form the results gained by the most ancient and the most recent scholars, extracted alike from the ill-digested *Variorum* and from countless monographs. Above all the editors have never feared to amuse as well as to instruct their readers. In their six volumes there are no dull pages. With this brilliancy they have combined most valuable original work. Dr. Purser's collation of the Harleian MSS. was an important contribution to knowledge, while the conjectures of the joint-editors have gained them an honourable place in the long list of scholars who have worked upon the purification of the text. The respect with which Continental critics regard their work is shewn by the fact that the veteran editor of Cicero, C. F. W. Müller, quotes their variants in *extenso*. Such consideration is rarely shewn to English scholars, and the editors must be conscious of that

modest satisfaction expressed by Cicero's quotation from Naevius.

Laetus sum laudari me abs te, pater, a laudato viro.

They are careful to point out that their work is not final. It is impossible that it should be, since the conditions have greatly changed during the past twenty years. A flood of light has been thrown upon various problems connected with the Letters by German scholars, and notably by Lehmann, Gurlitt, Schmidt and Mendelssohn. Indeed during this period more progress has been

made than at any previous epoch, except possibly that of the great French scholars, Lambinus, Bosius, and Turnebus. The editors therefore have modified their views on various points and do not claim to be consistent throughout. Such consistency will doubtless be arrived at eventually by a new edition of the earlier volumes. Meanwhile the English student can gratefully reflect that he is able to read the letters of Cicero in greater comfort and with the help of fuller knowledge at his disposal than anyone who is not familiar with his tongue.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

TAYLOR'S HISTORY OF ROME.

A Constitutional and Political History of Rome. By T. M. TAYLOR, M.A. Methuen and Co. Pp. 507. 7s. 6d.

MR. TAYLOR has supplied a very real want, and on the whole has supplied it well. Teachers and pupils will now be able without plunging into the mazes of Mommsen's *Staatsrecht* to acquire a good general notion of such important matters as the powers of the Senate in the successive stages of its history, the origin and development of the Equestrian 'Order', the financial and military organization of various epochs. Here is set forth in our own tongue an outline of the advance of the Roman polity from an aristocracy of birth through what seemed an incipient democracy to the rule of a nobility of office, and thence after a space of revolution and anarchy to the military monarchy; the necessity of this last and the benefits it brought to the world at large, Mr. Taylor recognizes emphatically without falling down and worshipping Caesar as a faultless being.

He is successful, once the extreme obscurity of the early period is left behind, in indicating the relations of the external, especially the military, history to the growth and working of the constitution. This is notably the case in the account of the Punic Wars (pp. 177-188), where the weak and strong qualities of both senate and populus are shewn with admirable fairness of appreciation. The effect of important personalities, too,—an element which may easily be slighted in a book of this kind,—is clearly brought out; the sketches of Flaminius (p. 173 f.), Scipio the Elder (p. 188), Gaius Gracchus (p. 247 f.), are particularly

good. The summary that closes the chapters on "The Struggle between the Orders" (p. 142 f.), the account of Gaius Gracchus' legislation (p. 248 f.), that of Caesar's work (p. 363 f.), the outline of the various tentatives made by Augustus for clothing his autocratic power (p. 408 f.) and the chapter on "The Princes and the Government" (p. 425 f.) are well executed and will doubtless be found very useful.

The first part of the book is less satisfactory, partly of necessity, owing to the uncertainties of the subject. Mr. Taylor is careful to warn his readers against resting in fancied security on any pretty hypothesis, and contrives to indicate in small space several of the divergent views, in many cases pointing out the difficulties that attend on each supposition—a method which the average student will probably not appreciate, though it is more salutary than dogmatism on matters so doubtful. However, a clear and logical theory is given of the origin and relations of the Concilium Plebis arranged by curies and by tribes, and the Comitia Tributa (pp. 61, 66, 72); also of the nature of plebiscita before 449 B.C. and the changes effected by the three laws supposed to have dealt with their validity (p. 85 f.). In a few passages the difficulty of the subject is increased by a want of lucidity in the treatment. Thus on p. 153 'Another class of "cives Romani," or full citizens, was formed by the Roman colonies' should imply by its 'another' that these were not included in the tribes, a statement which presumably is not intended. And similarly on p. 155 the discussion of the 'praefecturae' is introduced by 'There was also a class of towns

called "Praefecturae," although the conclusion is that these were the same as the second class of municipia mentioned just before. In the summary of political parties on p. 237 f, the difference should be made clearer between the 'Whig' party of the Elder Scipio and the 'Moderates' such as Aemilius Paullus who are distinguished from the 'Whigs.'

On p. 168 it is said that in the reform of the Comitia Centuriata the property qualifications for the various classes were probably not raised; a few lines lower down we are told that the assessments were raised; even if there is no real contradiction the expression might be improved. These are small points, but not unimportant as tending to confusion. I have noted one or two mistakes. Thus Cicero's noteworthy interview with Caesar in 49 B.C. took place at Formiae, not at Arpinum (p. 359), though the letter describing it is dated from the latter place. Only one son of Drusus was adopted by Tiberius, was popular and died before his adoptive father; Drusus the younger whom Mr. Taylor appears to have in mind as the other person answering to this description was the son of Tiberius. If 296 B.C. is given as the date of the publication of the Calendar (p. 137), it should not be stated that patricians alone were eligible to the Pontificate, since this ceased to be the case in 300 B.C. (p. 138).

Mr. Taylor by no means always adopts the views of Mommsen's *Staatsrecht*. Thus he accepts (p. 58) the oath by the whole community as the basis of the sacrosanct character of the Tribunes, a theory which Mommsen (*Staatsr.* 2³. 287) believes to be a bit of later constructive work. Mommsen's conjectures as to the probable date of the Reform in the Comitia Centuriata and its connection with Flaminius are adopted, but the commonly current view is taken as to

the number of centuries, namely that there were 70 for each class (p. 169); Mommsen's hypothesis grouping the 280 divisions of the 2nd-5th classes into 100 centuries (*Staatsr.* 3. 275 ff.) is not mentioned. *Patres Conscripti* are 'Senators on the Roll' with Willems, not 'Fathers and Enrolled' with Mommsen (p. 48). Those who interpret thus and at the same time accept, as Mr. Taylor does, the admission of plebeian members, must remember that they are supposing plebeians to have been formally included under the name 'patres.' It seems to me that this is impossible and that the impossibility is a strong argument for the 'Fathers and Enrolled' view, to which the 'qui patres qui conscripti' of Festus also lends support.

Mr. Taylor does not consider Cicero a 'trimmer' (p. 316); he also refuses the quality of statesman (pp. 317, 326), but grants that of honest republican (pp. 340, 380). The estimate given of Pompey is extremely contemptuous (p. 360 f.), though his loyalty to the republic is allowed to be a merit and not, as Mommsen would have it, a disgrace (p. 335). The introduction of monarchy is regarded not as a necessary evil but as a gain, and on the slaying of Caesar, Mr. Taylor pronounces that 'a more brutal and stupid crime was never perpetrated' (p. 377). Tiberius he believes to have shown himself a ruler of great ability in his management of the provinces and the army (p. 476); but the evils of the trials for *Maestas* are not passed over and no attempt is made to whitewash Gaius or Nero, though even under Nero the government is declared to have been good in the main (p. 484). The impression left by the book is that of great fairness and of a lucid and interesting presentment of a large proportion of the matters treated.

M. ALFORD.

ROUSE'S DEMONSTRATIONS IN GREEK IAMBIC VERSE.

Demonstrations in Greek Iambic Verse. By W. H. D. ROUSE, M.A., Cambridge. University Press. Pp. viii., 248.

MR. ROUSE, like King George I, 'surveying with judicious eyes the state of both his Universities,' sent to the Clarendon Press his 'demonstrations' in Latin elegiacs, and

has since sent to the Pitt Press a companion volume of demonstrations in Greek iambs. As a Cambridge man, I am sorry to say that I think Oxford had the better bargain. The later book seems to me inferior both in interest and in merit to the earlier.

It is true that much of this inferiority is due to the difference of the subjects. Latin

elegiacs are bound to seem ingenious and usually are so, and to watch a man making them has something of the interest of watching a man cutting fantastic shapes out of an orange peel. Greek iambs, on the other hand, are bound not to seem ingenious and usually are not so, and to watch a man making them is generally not much more interesting than to watch a man peeling potatoes. Mr. Rouse is evidently sensible of this difference, for his demonstrations deal largely with passages of stichomythia, which obviously tax the ingenuity. Besides that, he attempts to import into the problem more limitations than really exist. He begins by dividing iambic lines into twelve types according to the form of the words of which they are composed. So far as I can see, the only useful facts thus disclosed are that a final cretic must be preceded by a short syllable and that a bacchius can only stand just before the penthemimeral caesura. Mr. Rouse says that a molossus can only stand before the final iambus and (apparently) that a cretic can only occur in three positions, all of them behind the penthemimeral caesura. This is inexact.

πόρρωθεν εισόψει τὸ Δαρδάνου πῆδον
and
πόρρωθεν εισιδὼν τὸ Δαρδάνου πῆδον

are good enough lines for occasional use. He says also that a trochaic quadrisyllable can only occur before a final cretic or after an initial palimbacchius. But τῆς ὀρθοβούλου Θέμιδος αἰπνυμῆτα παῖ is a good line too. In fact, in all his remarks on rhythm he takes too little account of the large number of highly significant monosyllables in Greek. He goes on to show, by examples, that a sense-pause may occur after any syllable in the line and directs the student to break up his lines so that the sense-pause may not 'too often' occur at the caesura or the end of the line. That does not seem good advice for a beginner, who is pretty sure to think that 'too often' means 'very often.' In the various hints that follow nothing is said of the scansion of θεός, ποιεῖν, τοιοῦτος, and I notice (on p. 17) that Mr. Rouse quotes an unmetrical line (Soph. frag. 832) and mis-scans it. It would have been worth while here to call attention to the valuable chapter on the diction of tragedy in Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*. A long chapter is next given on language and style. About half of this, dealing with the similes and metaphors used in tragedy, is interesting, and must have cost much

labour, but is strictly irrelevant, for a translator is surely not at liberty to import similes and metaphors that are not indicated by his original. The remainder, on repetitions, synonyms, compound nouns and adjectives, and allied topics, is admirably well done, and seems to me the most useful part of the book. The 'demonstrations,' twenty-two in number, begin at p. 77. Here pieces of English (all but one in verse) are elaborately considered, by single lines or short passages at a time, with a view to translation. First the choice of words is discussed, then the 'form' or combination, but this division is not strictly maintained. Mr. Rouse appears to think that he is the first person to practise this kind of exercise. He is mistaken: many teachers use it from time to time, myself among them. I must confess, however, that I find these demonstrations almost unreadable. Here is the shortest example that I can find (p. 89):

'Pol. O altars of my country soil.

'WORDS.—'Altar': βαμός. 'Of my country': πατρίος, or paraphrase, as τῆσδε or ταύτης πατρίας χθονός.

'FORM.—It is possible to make a line out of the words suggested, but the tautology of πατρίος and πατριος is ugly. We therefore cast about for some verb, such as 'I hail,' 'I salute': προσκυνῶ. Now we get a simple beginning with spondee (βαμούς) and bacchius (πατρίους); τῆσδε being a trochee, place προσκυνῶ in the second cretic position and write:

Βαμούς πατρίους τῆσδε προσκυνῶ χθονός.'

There are 170 pages of this, *o dura doctrum illa!* No doubt the teacher is only expected to read one copy at a time, but I have difficulty in doing even this, and soon find myself picking out the version and skipping the explanations. There are more ways of making an iambic than of making a pentameter, and the demonstration entirely lacks the charm of the inevitable. The versions also do not seem to me so uniformly good as the Latin elegiacs were. They are not free from slips, such as μήτε ἀμύνον (p. 124), ἀπώθησας (p. 154), πλανήτης ὁδός (p. 184), φλογαῖς (p. 211): and there are some passages which, I think, would not be easily intelligible to a reader who did not know the English. This fault arises naturally from doing the translation by snippets and ignoring such little words as *the, my, his* every time. I will repeat therefore a criticism that I made on the demonstrations in elegiacs and suggest that Mr. Rouse should review his pieces as a whole and himself pass a judgment on the general effect of each. In my experience, this is a necessary part, and often the best part, of every such lesson. In conclusion, I will express my

regret that I am unable to give a more favourable account of a book which evinces on every page the highest qualities of a

teacher, knowledge and cleverness and patience.

J. Gow.

BRIEF NOTICES.

The Histories of Thucydides. Book VI.

Translated by E. C. MARCHANT, M.A.
Bell's Classical Translations, 1s.

How to Learn Philology: a simple and introductory book for Teachers and Learners.

By EUSTACE H. MILES, M.A. Swan
Sonnenschein. 5s. net.

THERE is certainly room for a new translation of Thucydides. So far, Dale's holds the field; for Jowett's can hardly be called a serious competitor, if only for its cost. Dale's translation, with all its faults has deserved its success, for, though there are many mistranslations in it, and it has no more style than a financial circular, the student can generally get at the meaning of Thucydides with its help. Jowett, again, had a marvellous art in smoothing over rough places, so that it is often impossible to say whether or no he understood the Greek, and the style is distinctly too modern. In matters of criticism and interpretation Mr. Marchant is ahead of them both, and so far any one who has used his valuable school edition of the sixth book will be ready to trust his judgment. It is not often we find such a questionable rendering as 'they survived the battle' for *περιγενόμενοι τῇ μάχῃ* (vi., 16); and he sometimes distinctly improves upon the received interpretation, as in Chap. 77, where the last phrase is neatly turned 'a master not less shrewd, but less scrupulous' (*οὐκ ἀξυμενέστερον, κακοξυμενέστερον δέ*). We may mention that in this place he has been anticipated by Hobbes. As to style, the new version is undoubtedly better than Dale, and we prefer it to Jowett. This is not saying that Mr. Marchant has produced the ideal translation of Thucydides; we speak comparatively. The style is not strong enough, and we doubt if this age of commonplace correctness can produce anything strong enough for Thucydides. Mr. Marchant in his preface speaks in a slighting vein of the old version by 'Leviathan' Hobbes; but Hobbes gives the air of Thucydides better than any other translation we know. He can manage the period as Mr. Marchant

cannot do. See, for example, the end of Chap. 69, and note Hobbes's neat turn for *ἐν παρέργῳ*. Mr. Marchant has '... while the enthusiasm of the subject allies was chiefly concerned with the prospect of immediate and irretrievable ruin in the event of a defeat, though not unprompted by the hope that in return for helping the Athenians to subdue others, they might find their own yoke lightened.' But Hobbes:—'and their subject-confederates came also on with great courage, principally for their better safety, as desperate if they overcame not, and withal upon the by, that by helping the Athenians to subdue the country of another, their own subjection might be easier.' If Hobbes had had Mr. Marchant's knowledge, we need have looked no further for a Thucydides. One word to the publishers, and we have done. Why must they publish their translations so cheap? They are throwing needless temptations in the way of schoolboys. We wish they would give the whole work at six shillings, and there an end.

If we may judge from internal evidence, this book consists of a number of miscellaneous papers set and solved by Mr. Miles in his capacity as "Honours Coach in Classics and Philology." There is a rich variety in the subjects. Beginning with the Advantages of Studying Philology and the relation of the parent language to its offspring, Mr. Miles touches upon Greek Dialects, Latin Inscriptions, Grimm's Law, some General Principles in Philology, the Analysis of Words, some Sound Changes and Technical Terms, Accents and Pronunciation, and then (but not before) he explains How Sounds are Made, the history of the classical Alphabets. The last chapters are on Sémantique, Greek Particles, Textual Criticism, and Eminent Philologists, with bibliography in an Appendix. As will be seen, Mr. Miles is not methodical; we should expect the organs of speech and the alphabet to come first, technical terms and principles next, things general before details. We do not think Mr. Miles's is the

right way to learn Philology, but there is no doubt that both teachers and learners will find the book useful. There is, as Mr. Miles says, no practical introduction for those who know nothing; and if the learner will rearrange his knowledge when he has studied this book, he will certainly be able to tackle Giles's *Manual* or Lindsay's *Latin Grammar* with greater benefit. For answer-

ing critical papers this book contains a mine of information. It remains to add that Mr. Miles is on the whole conservative, and a safe guide. The book, as we have said, is not methodical, and it does not cover the ground in any one of its numerous sections; but apart from the faulty form, the matter is good.

W. H. D. R.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

SAUER ON THE THESEION.

Das sogenannte Theseion und sein plastischer Schmuck, von DR. BRUNO SAUER. Leipzig (Giesecke and Devrient). 1899. 4to. Pp. x + 274. 32 M.

THE appearance of a monograph on the Theseion at once suggests a comparison, as the author observes in his opening sentence, with the famous work of Michaelis on the Parthenon. The present work, however, is strangely different in character from that sober and careful survey of all the materials available to illustrate the subject in hand.

After a few pages devoted to a sketch of the mediaeval and modern history of the building, the author turns to his main purpose, which is to determine the subjects of the pedimental groups, and so to find a name which shall finally supersede that of Temple of Theseus. As everyone knows, there is not the smallest fragment of sculpture in either pediment, and it was only by degrees that archaeologists became aware that there was once a group at each end. At the east end there are a few holes for supports in the tympanum blocks, and bedding-marks on the floor of the pediment. At the west end there are bedding-marks only. In 1890 Dr. Bruno Sauer, whose useful studies of the floors of the Parthenon pediments are well-known, undertook an examination of the Theseion. He carefully mapped all the marks, but as he frankly tells us, for two and a half years the results seemed almost *nil*. At the end of that time he could only say of the west pediment 'The only certain fact is that no figure stood exactly in the middle' (p. 15). But then, as he goes on to tell, 'Things took a surprising and delightful turn.' As the result of prolonged study, first the east and then the west pediment

groups began to take shape and an 'abstract reconstruction' of both was proved to be feasible. By a happy chance it appeared that in each pediment, but especially in the eastern, there was a figure of a peculiar kind from which it was possible to interpret the subjects, and thereby to name the temple. 'Thus only, the temple and its sculptures had become a single whole, and conclusions were justified, which could never have been drawn merely from the extant sculptures of the nameless building' (p. 15).

After these preliminaries, the reader approaches the investigation with a feeling of profound distrust. The author begins with a minute examination of the bedding-marks of the various plinths, and considers the probable attitudes of the figures that they supported, formulating, with rather more solemnity than the case seems to require, the law that the outlines of the plinths, and therefore of the bedding-marks, conform to the *Grundumrisse* of the statues—a law, however, which he does not always observe (cf. p. 50). The crucial fact in his examination of the East pediment is that between two of the bedding marks, numbered J and K, there is a considerable space, while a cutting away of the tympanum block in the interval to receive a projecting piece of sculpture, indicates that there must have been some piece of sculpture projecting over the interval, and counterpoised by its base. Starting from this foundation, and taking into consideration two holes for metal stays high up on the tympanum blocks, the author decides that the sculpture in question must have been a *Mischwesen*, since he cannot imagine either man or beast that would satisfy the conditions. On the other hand a *Mischwesen* (say Cecrops) might uplift human hands to the level of the upper stay holes, and if it projected over its base, the human

torso might be comfortably counter-balanced by a mass of curling tail.

The West pediment has no such significant message for the author, but he finds that the two ends were occupied with teams of four horses rising and sinking (as on the Parthenon, but withershins) and the middle by two seated figures, and a rather smaller kneeling figure.

At this point in the investigation (p. 51) the reader is solemnly warned that what follows is not written for the sceptic. Hitherto we have been examining actual marks on the floor; we now have to build upon them. The first thing to be done is to cast around for possible gods to own the subjects that were shown by the figures that stood on the plinths, that fitted the beds, that lie in the floors of the pediments of the temple that Sauer has rebuilt. The possibilities seem numerous, but after scrutiny the deities concerned are limited to Aphrodite, Apollo, Ares, Hephaestus, or Heracles (arranged with the impartiality of an alphabetical order). But for various reasons, all are ruled out except Hephaestus. The *Mischwesen* is Cecrops, and the scene is the birth of Erichthonios, and the temple is the Hephaisteion, tenanted jointly by Athene and Hephaestus. One trifling objection occurs, that Hephaestus himself, though he appears on vase paintings of the subject, is not present in the restored pediment of his own temple. Athene, seated, occupies the middle. Hephaestus might have stood beside her, but does not, for what reason the author cannot say (p. 70). Having recovered the pediment it only remains to criticize it, and the sculptor is roughly handled for his artistic mistakes. 'He left out entirely an important personage, he has torn asunder the principal group, which one would like to see as closely united as possible, he has substituted a moment of mere preparation for that of most pregnant meaning, he has omitted to inform us whence Ge and the child have come from. These are four bad offences against custom, and the artist has hardly anything to adduce in his defence, except the constraint of the unfavourable space' (p. 72). The criticism may be just as applied to the published pediment, but on the evidence an impartial reader may think it hard upon the reputation of Amphion of Cnossos (who is subsequently drawn from his retreat and identified as the culprit) that he should be called on to defend the composition.

It is unnecessary to examine the west pediment at length. It is sufficient to say that it represents Hephaestus, newly fallen

from Olympos and doing homage to Thetis, who, as we know, received him kindly on that occasion (*Iliad* xviii. 394). Hephaestus is represented as a youth, lightly bending on one knee. There is no indication whatever of how

'From morn

To noon he fell, from noon to dewy eve

A summer's day, and with the setting sun

Dropt from the zenith like a falling star.'

Such are the main outlines of the investigation. The proofs, if proofs they can be called, absolutely fail to convince, and the drawings in which the conclusions are embodied are insipid and improbable. The whole fabric falls to pieces when an alternative is proposed. In this connexion it is interesting to observe that Prof. Furtwaengler (who has himself on occasion obtained notable results from a study of footprints on pedestals—see *Meisterwerke*, pp. 451-506) has brushed away Sauer's 'fantastic reconstructions' in order to substitute two figures which were obtained independently in Rome, and are now together in the Jacobsen collection at Ny Carlsberg (*Sitzungsber. d. Philos.-philol. Cl. d. k. bayer. Akad.* 1899, ii. p. 279). The figures are Niobids, from a pediment group of 450-440 B.C. by Cresilas, and may be assigned to the Theseion, which in that case is a temple of Apollo Patroos. Furtwaengler hopes to obtain casts of the plinths, and try if they can be fitted to the bedding marks of the pediment. For the present purpose it is only necessary to remark that the two figures are quite unlike anything imagined by Sauer.

After discussing the pediments, with the results above described, the author begins a more sane and profitable examination of sculptures that really exist. Probably there are few readers who will not obtain a clearer conception of the more mutilated metopes from a study of his plates, and the superimposed tracing-paper restorations. But it is on his rediscovery of the pedimental groups that the author lays most stress. His solution is proposed in all good faith, but a parody of current archaeological methods would not be written otherwise.

A. H. SMITH.

SCHMIDT'S *VILLAS OF CICERO*.

Ciceros Villen. von OTTO EDUARD SCHMIDT. Leipzig, Teubner. 1899.

No one has deserved better of Cicero's Epistles than Dr. O. E. Schmidt. On every

department of investigation which bears on their restoration, arrangement and elucidation, he has contributed disquisitions learned, acute, patient, comprehensive, and convincing. All these qualities are exhibited in this attractive treatise on Cicero's Villas; but there is something additional here which we have not noticed elsewhere in his writings, vivid description of landscape, poetical feeling for the mass of associations which every spot almost of Italian ground calls up, and deep sympathy for the 'humanity' of the great man to whose memory he is devoting his learning and his genius.

There is a natural tendency among archaeologists to dispute any traditional site of a celebrated place or event. In each locality where we know Cicero had a Villa, some spot is pointed out to the tourist as the Villa di Cicerone: but archaeologists are loth to accept them. Thus for the Tusculanum they reject the position which the guide-books give on the hill sloping up from Frascati to the Castle of Tusculum, and put it down in the valley near the Via Latina. Dr. Schmidt seems to me to have all but demonstrated that Cicero's Villa lay on the hill; see his admirable discussion, pp. 31-33, especially the quotation from the Schol. Cruquianus on Horace Epod. 1. 29 '*Tusculi superni, hoc est in monte siti ad cuius latera superiora Cicero suam villam habebat Tusculanam.*' In the course of this discussion he maintains with a high degree of probability the view that the Aqua Crabra was an aqueduct which brought water from the high hills east of Tusculum and was used mainly, if not entirely, by the numerous villas which studded the slope of the Tusculan hill; cf. Frontinus *De Aq.* 9 ea (sc. Aqua Crabra) namque est quam omnes villae tractus eius per vicem in dies modulosque certos dispensatam accipiunt: Strabo v. 239 states that the villas were mostly on the rising ground. Again Dr. Schmidt shows (pp. 53 ff.), against Overbeck, that the Villa di Cicerone just outside the walls of Pompeii, on the Street of the Tombs, must have been his Pompeianum. No other place in this vicinity, says Dr. Schmidt, is visible from Bauli (cf. *Acad.* ii. 80), and from no other place close to Pompeii could his near neighbour Marius, who probably owned what is called the Villa of Diomedes, see the bay of Stabiae (cf. *Fam.* vii. 1. 1). There is considerable probability that Cicero's Formianum, also called Caietanum (*Att.* i. 4. 3), was where local opinion places it, viz. in the Villa Caposele, where the inscription of an Arrius was found, *C.I.L.* x.

6101; and the round tower near Formiae called Sepolcro di Cicerone almost certainly stands on the spot where the orator was murdered, even though it may not have been intended to perpetuate his memory (p. 29). The position of the Villa di Cicerone west of Puteoli was probably the Puteolanum. It is also called horti Cluviani, and was owned by the banker Cluvius. In 45 B.C., on the death of Cluvius, it was bought by Cicero as a speculation and appears to have been let out by him at a considerable profit; he hoped ultimately to get 100 per cent. on his outlay (this seems to be the meaning of *Att.* xiv. 10. 3). The position of the Cumanum, the fashionable villa where Cicero entertained his distinguished guests such as Caesar, is accurately described by Pliny *H.N.* xxxi. 6—who, however, erroneously calls it Academia, which doubtless was a gymnasium in the Cumanum, cp. the Academia and Lyceum in the Tusculanum (*Att.* i. 4. 3, *Tusc.* ii. 9, *De Div.* i. 8)—as on the Lucrine Lake, where it was skirted by the road from Lake Avernus to Puteoli. It accordingly lies buried under Monte Nuovo. The house which Cicero owned at Antium cannot be fixed; perhaps it has been swallowed up by the sea. Nor the lodge at Astura. As regards the Arpinas, there is universal agreement that it lay in the delta formed at the junction of the Fibrenus and the Liris, and most probably on the spot where the Dominican convent of S. Paolo now stands.

Interspersed with arguments establishing the position of the villas are interesting discussions on details. The Amaltheum Dr. S. regards as an integral part of the villa at Arpinum, a sort of basilica at its eastern end. I should prefer to consider it an independent little temple in the grounds. As regards *τοποθερία* (*Att.* i. 16, 18 *Velim ad me scribas cuiusmodi sit 'Ἀμαλθείον tuum quo ornatu, qua τοποθερία*) he seems to hold that it refers to paintings of landscapes on the walls of the shrine. Perhaps a simpler view would be to take it as referring to the surroundings which would form a 'setting,' accessories and background, to the shrine itself, such as (say) flower-beds, fountains, trees. Indeed we hear of plane-trees which were planted about the Amaltheum of Atticus *De Leg.* ii. 7. The actual ornamentation of the shrine itself would seem to be included under 'ornatu.' And it is not by any means certain that the relief which Dr. S. (p. 18) adduces from Roscher, *Lexikon der Mythologie* i. 263 refers to the nourishing of Zeus by Amalthea, cf. Saglio in his *Dict.* i. p. 220.

The arguments by which Dr. S. (pp. 20-23) desires to convince himself that Cicero's earthly remains rest with those of his fathers in his ancestral home, must fail to carry conviction to his readers, however willing they may be to believe it. Martial (xi. 48) says that Silius Italicus owned the tomb of Virgil and the lands of Cicero, and that neither Virgil nor Cicero would have preferred any other heir *sui tumulive larise*. It would appear that the poet meant *tumuli* to refer to Virgil, and *laris* to Cicero: and the passage cannot be adduced as a proof that in owning the Arpinate estate Silius owned the tomb of Cicero. But that it was the Arpinate estate which Silius owned, not the Tusculanum or Cumanum, Dr. S. and Nissen are right in holding. The Arpinas was the only villa of Cicero's with a considerable amount of land attached. The riddle in *Att.* xii. 47 (40), 3 as to the owner of a magnificent villa at Baiae (*optimas Baias*) who yet spent a considerable part of his time at lonely Astura is answered by Dr. S. as evidently referring to Hortensius. Possibly, but not evidently. True, it was at Astura that Cicero conceived, if he did not actually write, the famous treatise which bears that orator's name: but the splendid villa of Hortensius was at Bauli south of Baiae (*Acad.* ii. 9) while the villa of Hortensius which Cicero wished to buy was at Puteoli (*Att.* vii. 3, 9). It was perhaps an inferior building which Cicero intended to let out as a speculation like the Cluviana praedia. In Cicero's time we find that Philippus, the step-father of Augustus spent a portion of his time at Astura, *Att.* xii. 9: 16; 18, 1: xv. 12, 2; though he owned a villa close to Cicero's Cumanum, xiv. 11, 2; cf. xiii. 52, 1: but the imperfects (*habebat . . . solebat*) show that the reference is to a man who was dead. Perhaps Cicero was thinking of the father of Philippus, the great orator, who may have left the villas in both places to his son.

That Cicero's friend Marius owned the so-called Villa of Diomedes just outside Pompeii, Dr. S. thinks probable pp. 56, 57. It would appear that Marius as well as Cicero (see pp. 48, 55, 61) liked to have a view of the sea when he was working; so he made a window in the back of his house which gave him a view of the Bay of Stabiae. The passage *Fam.* vii. 1, 1 might accordingly be thus emended '*ex quo tibi <fenestras> perforasti et patefecisti sinum Stabianum.*' The latter word got out of place (or just possibly was a gloss on *sinum*), was written over *fenestras*, and finally extruded it: *perforare* is used in two passages

of Cicero with reference to opening out a window, cf. *N.D.* iii. 9; *Tusc.* i. 46.

But the learning and ingenuity of the author—and they are great—are not more worthy of admiration than the generous and warm sympathy which he has for Cicero, the man. We gladly quote at length a passage towards the end of the treatise (p. 61), not only because it sums up the many relations in which the many-sided Cicero stood to his villas, but also because it is instinct with the feeling which all broad-minded and fair-minded critics of Cicero must entertain for his whole personality.

'There can be no doubt. The Pompeianum was as regards its position the crown of all the possessions of Cicero. Here as well as at Tusculanum he was not the statesman as at Rome, nor the philosophizing country-gentleman as at Arpinum; not the bearer of his great name and the man of society as at the Lucrine Lake, nor the representative of the earning-classes and man of business as at Formiae and Puteoli: here he was not the cheerful comrade of his friends as at Antium, nor the mourning father as at Astura—but here he was a man in the highest sense of the word. And his humanity was after all the crown too of his nature, and of this no one can rob him, not even he who disputes his title to be a statesman, an orator or a writer. Pure human-ness remains, after all is said, the greatest and most refreshing element in his letters and in his philosophical writings; and the imperishable value of these lies just in this, that they are the outcome of a living personality and let us feel throughout the pulsation of real life.'

L. C. PURSER.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY.

Rhenish Provinces.—The pre-Roman and Roman fortifications in Northern Alsace and the Southern Pfalz have now been thoroughly investigated. Twenty-four new earthworks have been brought to light, and a series of tumuli and ancient trackways surveyed. There was evidently a complete system of fortification against attacks from the East, as indicated by the series of small *castella* along the roads. These appear to be the *burgi* of Vegetius and Orosius. On the Wasenbourg by Niederbronn were found about twenty sculptures of late Roman date, including a copy of Hermes with the child Dionysos in relief.

Investigations have also been made on the right bank of the Rhine, with similar results. These earthworks appear to fall into four classes, two barbarian and two Roman: (1) pre-Roman, oval and ring-shaped; (2) post-Roman quadrangular "refuges"; (3) late Roman road and river-passage forts of irregular form; (4) late Roman *speculae*.¹

Köngen.—At this well-known Roman station several interesting objects have lately been found. Among them are a milestone of A.D. 129 inscribed A SVML [OCENNA] M P XXVIII; and an inscription: I H D D I O M | PLATIAE D G | ... MELO- CENES | VICI GRINAR | MACERIAM D S P. This fixes the situation of Grinario, mentioned in the Peutinger Table, but not hitherto settled. It is suggested that the second and third lines should be restored PLATIAE DEXTRAE SVMELOCENES. The distance between Sumelocenna and Grinario is now fixed for the first time by these two inscriptions.²

ITALY.

Rome.—Excavations are taking place under the Church of S. Cecilia, where the discovery of a bathroom has led to the finding of a whole palace of considerable extent, dating from the latter half of the second century. The walls are of brickwork, with marble decorations, and there are pavements of mosaic. Two good marble sarcophagi were found, one representing the Calydonian boar hunt.³

The excavation of the Basilica Aemilia has been concluded for the time being, but sufficient knowledge has been gained of its plan and elevation. It consists of three parts: a central hall with nave and

aisles, two rows of *tabernae* or cells on either side opening outwards, and porticoes on the long sides. The central hall or basilica proper resembles Trajan's, except that it has two aisles instead of four. The pavements which are well preserved, were covered with loose copper coins of about 500 A.D., many melted together in masses. The central hall had an upper colonnade like that of the Basilica Julia. On the frieze of the lower order is a commemorative inscription of which only two fragments have so far been recovered, with the words REST . . . PAVL. But even these tell us something of the history of the building. It was, as we know, rebuilt by L. Aemilius Paullus in B.C. 59 with the spoils of Gaulish wars, and solemnly dedicated in B.C. 34, after twenty-five years' work. The fragments recently discovered are of the time of Tiberius.⁴

ASIA MINOR.

Ephesus.—Excavations in the theatre have resulted in the laying bare of the stage-buildings and orchestra, also of the huge north wall of the auditorium, and the streets leading up to it; the work on the south side is still in progress. The partial draining of the marshes in the direction of the ancient harbour has yielded a large archway of Hellenic times, the end of a street from the theatre. Numerous inscriptions and sculptures are now at Vienna. They include a life-size bronze athlete and a bronze group of Herakles and a Centaur, both from the Roman Agora, and a series of statues and reliefs from the decoration of the theatre-buildings.⁵

H. B. WALTERS.

¹ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 17 Feb.² *Ibid.* 10 March.³ *Athenaeum*, 18 Jan.⁴ *Athenaeum*, March 3.⁵ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 20 Jan.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. 55, Part 1. 1900.

Etruskisch-Kampanische Urkunde, F. Buecheler. Here is given the text of an Etruscan inscription found on a clay slab in the cemetery of old Capua, which since last year has been in the royal museum in Berlin. *Zu Platons Philebus*, C. Apelt. Various critical and explanatory notes. *Untersuchungen zu Ciceros Timaeus*, C. Fries (conclusion). The date of the preface is after the *Academia*, so after B.C. 45, in which year Nigidius Figulus died. The fragment was about the time of the *Trusculans* and there is no difficulty in reconciling the date of the fragment with that of the preface. It is difficult, on account of Cicero's eclecticism, to say what was his object in making the translation—Hermann's hypothesis that we may see in this part of a dialogue upon *φύσις* is probable. In an appendix are given the readings of cod. Par. 6624, some extracts from the translation by Marsilius Ficinus, and the reason why no fragments of Cicero's translation of the *Oeconomica* are given upon the question of the authenticity of the *Timaeus*. *Der Schluss der aeolischen Epos vom Zorne des Achill*, W. Helbig. The old Aeolic epic ended with the death of Hector. When taken over by the Ionians it was re-edited and various interpolations made. It is probable that 184-191 of Book 23 were

added by the Ionian editor, whose business it was to make a more or less consistent whole out of poems of different styles and partly inconsistent contents. *Neue Fluchtafel*, R. Wünsch. Some elucidations of Ziebarth's *Neue attische Fluchtafel*. *Die Idee der ersten Eclogie Vergils*, M. Schanz. Tityrus combines in himself two irreconcilable elements—if Augustus is to be thanked for giving him freedom, he must be a slave, if it is for protecting his property, then Tityrus must be a free man. He is at once the representative of Vergil and of the Roman people. *Vermischtes zu den griechischen Lyrikern und aus Papyri*, F. Blass. The well-known fact that the Greek poets, lyric as well as tragic, were accustomed to strengthen the correspondence between strophe and antistrophe by the use of like-sounding words is illustrated. Critical notes on some of the fragments published by Grenfell and Hunt. *Der Inhalt des Georgos von Menander*, K. Dziatzko (conclusion). Examines the *Epidicus* in connexion with the *Georgos*, and thinks that Plautus imitated with great independence. *Zur aristotelischen καθαρσις*, G. Lehnert. Agrees with Nicolaï's polemic against the statement 'that the end of tragedy is the arousing of the passions, and that the best tragedy is that which arouses the passions to the highest degree, not that which is intended to purify them.' Porcius

Licinus über den Anfang der römischen Kunsstdichtung, R. Büttner. Maintains the usual opinion that the lines of Porcius Licinus quoted by Gellius (xvii. 21, 42) refer to Ennius, while Leo and Schanz refer them to Livius Andronicus. *Der Pindarcommentator Chrysippos*, A. Koerte. He was one of the successors of Aristarchus and may be put about the end of the second century B.C. Probably he is the one mentioned by Cicero in a letter to his brother (54/3) and the pedagogue to whom Cicero entrusted his son. *Zur Epitome des Adamantios*. R. Foerster. A new text given from a Paris MS.

MISCELLAN. *Varia*, L. Radermacher. *De Sophoclis Electrae loco nondum satis explicato*, J. M. Stahl. On vv. 221-229. *Der anonyme Hermogenes-Kommentar in Messina*, H. Rabe. The text given with critical notes. *Zu den versus cuiusdam Scoti de alphabeto*, A. Breysig. *Berichtigung und Entgegnung zu Thukydides*, J. M. Stahl. On iv. 63. 1 *καὶ τὸ ἦδη φοβερός παρέρτας*.

Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, etc. Vol. 3. Part 9. 1899.

Zum gegenwärtigen Stande der Platonischen Frage (conclusion), O. Immisch. He makes out five groups, (1) early works: the two *Hippias* and *Ion*. In 403 *Phaedrus* and soon afterwards *Protagoras*. (2) The first decade of the 4th cent. till the first Sicilian journey: *Gorgias* (399 or thereabout). Residence in Megara and journeys: *Apology*, *Crito*, *Euthyphro*, *Meno* (about 395), *Cratylus*, *Rep. I*. *Rep. V*. 18-VII. (3) From the date of the founding of a school to the second journey (387) or, in round numbers, the second and third decades of the 4th cent. The didactic group, i.e. *Laches*, *Euthydemus*, *Menexenus*, *Charmides*, *Lysis*, *Rep. II*. V. 16 (except IV. 6-19), *Symposium* (after 384), *Phaedo*. (4) Between the second and third journeys (381): completion of the *Republic*, *Theaetetus*. (5) Dialogues of old age: *Parmenides*, *Philebus*, *Sophistes*, *Politicus*, *Timaeus*, *Critias*, *Leges*. This order is based on the development of the artistic form of the dialogue, not on statistics of language.

Part 10. *Die neueren Forschungen in Kleinasien*, E. Kalinka. Excavations in Pergamum, Magnesia, Priene, etc. give us information about the classical period. Next are the geographical and topographical investigations in the provinces, the makings of ancient streets and naming of ruined statues. Most works of the best art are in safety, for coins the land is almost an undiscovered country. Most of the inscriptions (about 20,000) are in Greek; there are about 150 in the Lycian tongue, probably of 6th-4th cent. B.C. Kalinka agrees with Kretschmer in thinking that the Lycians with the Carians, Pisidians and Cilicians are neither semitic nor indogermanic in language but belong to a group by themselves. *Die Stellung der arbeitenden Klassen in Hellas und Rom*, F. Cauer. Hesiod first tells us of the worth of labour. At first it was honoured at Athens. The Sophists set no value on it however and Socrates, while he honoured the labourer as such, considered him unfit for politics. Greek philosophy despised the common workman, as by this time such work was done by slaves. In Rome demoralisation quickly followed the wholesale expropriation of the small landholders. The estates were worked by slaves, while the peasants flocked to Rome. Sulla's colonies were a failure; Caesar and Augustus made a new position for peasants but they could not withstand the social forces against them.

Memosyne. Vol. 27. Part 4. 1899.

Spicilegium Statianum, H. T. Karsten. *Varia ad varios*, H. van Herwerden. Notes on Pindar, Theo-

critus, Sophocles, the Oxyrhynchus papyri, Epigraphica, Photii Lexicon, Stobaei Florilegium, and Stobaei Eclogae. *Observationes Miscellaneae ad Plutarchi Vitae Parallelas* (continued), S. A. Naber. *Quisquilae II.*, J. W. Beck. On *Porro*=antea, supra, prius. Besides in Apuleius this meaning is found in *Or. Fasti I.* 635 and *Cic. Sen.* § 43. On *Distentare vel Distennare* in Apuleius, illustrated by Plautus.

Vol 28. Part I, 1900.

De fragmentis Ennianis a Paulo Merula editis, P. J. Blok. Maintains the good faith of Merula in this publication. *Aedilem gero*=aeditilatem gero, J. W. Beck. See *Apul.* (Met. I 24) for this. *Ad Aeschylus Agam.* 25 sqq. J. C. Vollgraff. In 32 reads τὰ δεσποτῶν γὰρ εἰς πεσόνθ' ὡς ἥδομαι. *Apulei Floridum fragmentum xvi.*, J. van der Vliet. Critical notes. *Ad Anthologiae Graecae librum vii.*, H. van Herwerden. Critical notes on Stadtmüller's edition. *Ad Tertullianum*, J. W. Beck. Note on *Apolog.* 24. *Thucydidea*, J. C. Vollgraff. Notes on Book II. with reference to Hude's edition. *Ad Apuleium*, J. W. Beck. In *Met.* v. 28 for vel maxime reads ut maxime. *Observationes de iure Romano* (continued) J. C. Naber, *De actionis denegatione*. *Observationes Miscellaneae ad Plutarchi Moralia*, S. A. Naber.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie, 1900.

3 Jan. L. Pollak, *Zwei Vasen aus der Werkstatt Hierons* (W. Amelung), very favourable. F. J. Engel, *Zum Rechte der Schutzflehenden bei Homer* (P. Cauer), very favourable. H. Schrader, *De Plutarchi Chaeronensis 'Ομπρικὰς μελέτας* (P. Cauer), very favourable. W. Drumann, *Geschichte Roms*. 2. A. von P. Groebe, I (O. E. Schmidt), favourable. O. Alberts, *Aristotelische Philosophie in der türkischen Literatur des 11. Jahrhunderts* (A. Döring), favourable.

10 Jan. *Homer's Iliad*, books xix-xxiv, by E. B. Clapp (H. Cauer), favourable. A. Patin, *Parmenides im Kampfe gegen Heraklit* A. Döring. Interesting to the specialist but the results not clearly stated. *Anthologia graeca*, ed. H. Stadtmüller, II. 1 (H. Spiro), very favourable. P. Ribbeck, *Senatores Romani qui fuerint Idibus Martiis anni a.u.c. 710* (J. Tolkiehn), favourable.

17. Jan. W. Soltan, *Eine Lücke der Synoptischen Forschung* (A. Gercke). 'Shows earnest consideration and sound conclusions.' *Senofonte, L'Agésilao* (O. Güthling), unfavourable. *Lexique de Plaute*, sous la direction de P. Waltzing. *A—accipio* (O. Plasberg). *Germanici Caesaris Aratea*, it. ed. A. Breysig (R. Helm). 'Thanks deserved for great labour.' E. Klebs, *Die Erzählung des Apollonius aus Tyrus* (R. Helm). 'The fruit of long and self-denying toil.' H. Gelzer, *Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (F. Hirsch), favourable.

24 Jan. Pauly's *Realencyklopädie*, herausg. von G. Wissowa VI. Halbband (Fr. Harder). H. Bertsch, *Meeresriesen Erdgeister und Lichtgötter in Griechenland* (H. Steuding). 'No certain results attained.' Fr. Grosshauser, *Aesculap und Hippokratēs* (—g.). 'Utterly worthless.' S. Anton, *Die Mysterien von Eleusis* (H. Steuding). 'Very thorough but without anything new.' A. Mau, *Führer durch Pompeji*. 3. A. (H. Belling), very favourable. J. Kubik, *Pompeji im Gymnasialunterricht* (L. Gurlitt). 'Very useful.' Br. Rappaport, *Die Einfälle der Goten in das römische Reich bis auf Constantin* (F. Dahn). 'A most excellent work.' Joannes Philoponus, *De aeternitate mundi*, ed. H. Rabe (F. Hirsch). 'Written with care and skill.'

31 Jan. U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Ägypten und Nubien* (M. Rostowzew). 'An indispensable book for specialists.' A. Malfether, *Reclerklärung und Anschauungsunterricht bei der Lektüre der griechischen Klassiker*, I. Xenophon, Homer, Herodot (L. Gurlitt). 'Concise and solid.' M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. II. Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian. I. Hälfte, *Die augustische Zeit*. 2. A. (Fr. Harder). *Statii Silvarum libri*, erkl. von Fr. Vollmer (P. Kerckhoff). 'Almost too thorough.' II. Glaesener, *Les caractères dans la Thebaïde de Stace* (P. Kerckhoff). 'Reaches no satisfactory result.' *Fran filologiska föreningen i Lund* (H. Belling). In the field of classical philology are the following: J. Paulson, *In Lucretium adversaria*; A. Ahlberg, *Adnotationes in acentum Plautinum*; M. Nilsson, *De republica Atheniensium a Clithene constituta*; and C. Lindskog, *De usu pronominum personalium*.

7 Feb. *Klassischer Skulpturenschatz*, herausg. von F. v. Reber und A. Bayersdorfer. II. Jahrgang Heft 4 bis IV. Jahrgang Heft 5 (W. Amelung). 'This very praiseworthy undertaking.' H. Meuss, *Tyche bei den altischen Tragikern* (H. Steuding), favourable. E. Ziegler, *Zwölf Reden Ciceros disponiert* (W. Hirschfelder). 'Very useful.' L. Borsari, *Topografia di Roma antica* (H. Belling), very favourable. E. Sehmisdorf, *Die Germanen in den Balkanländern bis zum Auftreten der Goten* (F. Dahn). 'Too untrained in method.'

14 Feb. *Jahresberichte über das höhere Schulwesen* herausg. von C. Rethwisch. XIII. Jahrgang (O. Weissenfels). C. Justi, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*. 2. A. (P. Herrmann), very favourable. H. Nohl, *Schülerkommentar zu Ciceros Rede für Sex. Roscius* (W. Hirschfelder), favourable. Fr. Schlee, *Zwei Berliner Sallusthandschriften* (Th. Opitz). G. Muccio, *Osservazioni zu Sallustio filosofo* (K. Praechter), unfavourable. E. Rolland, *Une copie de la vie de S. Théodose par Théodore* (J. Draeseke), unfavourable.

21 Feb. A. Erman und Fr. Krebs, *Aus den Papyrus der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin* (C. Wessely), very favourable. O. Kern, *Inscriptiones Thesalicae* (O. Schulthess), favourable. A. Holm, W. Deecke, W. Soltan, *Kulturgeschichte des Klassischen Altertums* (H. Belling), unfavourable. F. Ramorino, *Tacito nella storia della cultura* (Th. Opitz), favourable. *Taciti De vita et moribus Agricolaë liber* ed. G. Nemethy, (Th. Opitz), favourable. K. Krumbacher, *Um arbeitungen bei Romanos* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

28 Feb. *Egypt Exploration Fund. Archaeological Report 1898-1899*, ed. by L. Griffith (A. Wiedemann), favourable. A. Sakellarios, *Παρατήρησις κριτική καὶ παλαιογραφική εἰς τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους Ἀθηναίων πολιτείαν* (Schneider), favourable. *Lucianus rec. J. Sommerbrodt* III. (P. Schulze). 'Every reader of Lucian will be thankful for this.' *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti* duce Sc. de Vries V. *Plautus. Codex Heidelberg. 1613*. Praefatus est C. Zangemeister (O. Plasberg), favourable. A. Schulten, *Die römische Flurteilung und ihre Reste* (B. Kübler). 'A worthy contribution.' G. M. Lane, *A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges* (C. Stegmann). 'Very useful for students, but not suitable for schools.'

7 March. N. Svoronos, *Der athenische Volkskalendar* (G. Thiele). 'On the whole, sheds darkness rather than light.' H. Diels, *Elementum* (O. Weissenfels). An introduction to the Greek and Latin thesaurus, unfavourable. Fr. Stolle, *Wo schlug Cäsar den Ariovist?* (J. W.), favourable.

14 March. Fr. Boll, *Beiträge zur Überlieferungs-geschichte der griechischen Astrologie und Astronomie*, (K. Manitius), favourable. P. Gnjeditsch *Kunstgeschichte*, I. (H. Dannenberg). 'Only the type and the illustrations can be praised.' A. Mau, *Pompeii, its life and art*, transl. by F. W. Kelsey, (H. Belling), favourable. L. Delisle, *Notice sur la rhétorique de Cicéron*, trad. par Jean d'Antioche (Th. Zielinski), favourable. G. Schimmelpfeng, *Erzählliche Horazekltüre*, 2 A. (O. Weissenfels). 'Sure of a sympathetic reception.' *Vitruvii de architectura libri X*, it. ed. V. Rose, (H. Nohl), very favourable. *Passages for Greek translation*, by H. Peacock and W. Bell (H. D.), favourable.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. 24, 1. January 1900.

Figures tirées d'un manuscrit des Météorologiques d'Aristote, C. Graux et A. Martin. From a Greek MS. in the private library of the King of Spain, with three plates and thirteen figures. *Le littoral de l'Inde d'après Pomponius Mela*, L. Malavialle. In Mela (iii, 67) for *Oras tenet ab imo read a Tanno*, and for *ab Colide ad Cudum* read *ad Indum*. *Anciennes gammes enharmoniques*, L. Laloy. A second art. Aristides Quintilian (p. 21 Meib.) gives six scales which all contain the quarters of tones characteristic of the *genre enharmonique*. They were used in very ancient times and are referred to by Plato (*Rep.* 398). These scales are not like those we are used to meet with, but the text is explicit. *Plaute*, A. Macé. In *Miles* 1022 reads *propera nam astando exerucior*, ib. 1088, *Atque adeo audin? dic cito docte et cordate*, Trin. 176 *Advorsum quae ejus me opsece- visset pater*, ib. 289-291 *Lacrumas haec mihi, quom video, eliciunt. Quid ego ad hoc genus hominum duravi? quin prius me ad pluris penetravi?* following Redalob, ib. 318 Lys. *Quid exprobras? Phil. bene quod fecisti tibi fecisti non mihi*, ib. 332, *Mer- caturam? an venalis habuit, ubi rem perdidit?* Orphica, Frag. 2 Abel, P. Jannery. This piece of sixty-six verses *περὶ σεσημῶν* ought to be kept in the *Anthologies*. It is anonymous, has nothing to do with orphism, and is not antique, having been composed under the empire. *Salluste Histoires*, M. Bonnet. In ii, 87 *ruinae multorum fossae sem- pletae sunt*, for *sempletae* read *impletae*, there having been a dittography of the last syllable of *fossae*. In i, 88 read *multaque . . . per invidiam scriptorum parum celebrata sunt. Aurelius Victor*, Epit. xxv, J. Chauvin. Read with two MSS. *nec (= not even) catulum for neccatulum*. *Fragment d'une liste de vainqueurs aux jeux olympiques* (Papyrus d'Oxyrhynchus), T. W. Beasley. Revises by this the chronology of certain odes of Pindar and Bacchylides and makes other criticisms. *Note sur le Papyrus cœvsi. d'Oxyrhynchus*, B. Haussoullier. Critical remarks and reconstitution of part of the text.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

- Adler* (F.) Das Mausoleum zu Halikarnass. (Aus "Zeitschrift für Bauwesen"). Folio. 12 pp., 5 plates. Berlin, Ernst & S. 12 M.
- Aeschylus*. Prometheus vincit. Edited by F. C. Plaistowe and T. R. Mills. With introduction, notes, and translation. Crown 8vo, 124 pp. (Univ. Tutor. Series). Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Antiphon*. Kohm (J.) Neue Antiphon-Studien. 8vo. 20 pp. Wien.
- Archilochus*. Reitzenstein (R.) Zwei neue Fragmente der Epoden des Archilochus. 8vo. 8 pp., 1 plate. Berlin.
- Aristoteles*. Marchl (P.) Des Aristoteles Lehre von der Tierseele III. 8vo. 40 pp. Metten.
- Bacchylides*. Schöne (J.) De dialecto Bacchylidea. 8vo. 129 pp. Leipzig.
- Boor* (C. de.) Bericht über eine Studienreise nach Italien, Spanien und England zum Zwecke handschriftlicher Studien über byzantinische Chronisten. 8vo. 14 pp. Berlin.
- Bruns* (Ivo.) Frauenemancipation in Athen, ein Beitrag zur attischen Kulturgeschichte des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts. 8vo. 31 pp. Kiel. 1 M. 40.
- Cicero*. Zingler (Jo.) De Cicerone historico quaestiones. 8vo. iv, 38 pp. Berlin, Mayer & M. 1 M. 20.
- Comici Graeci*. Greek Comic Poets. Select Fragments. Edited by A. W. Pickard. Cambridge. Crown 8vo. Frowde. 5s.
- Contil* (L.) Les figurines en terre cuite des Eburovices, Veliocasses et Lexovii. Étude générale sur les Venus à gaines de la Gaule romaine. 8vo. 84 pp., atlas of 23 plates. Evreux.
- Deubner* (L.) De incubatione capitula duo. 8vo. 48 pp. Giessen.
- Eratosthenes*. Rehm (A.) Eratosthenis Catasterismorum fragmenta vaticana. Praemisum est de Catasterismorum recensionibus commentariolum. xvi, 18 pp. Auerbach.
- Euripides*. Swoboda (A.) Zur Kritik und Erklärung von Euripides Iphigenia in Aulis. 8vo. 12 pp. Wien.
- Eusebius*. Schöne (Alfr.) Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus. 8vo. xiii, 280 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 8 M.
- Fischer* (J.) Ad artis veterum onirocriticae historiam symbola. 8vo. 50 pp. Jena.
- Gennadius*. Czaplá (B.) Gennadius als Litterarhistoriker. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung der Schrift des Gennadius von Marseille "De viris illustribus." 8vo. 42 pp. Münster.
- Georgii* (W.) Über den Verfasser der grammatischen Chrestomathie. 8vo. 26 pp. Kaiserslautern.
- Glossarium latinorum Corpus*. Vol. VI. Fasc. II. (Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum confect G. Goetz. Pars I. Fasc. II.) 8vo. pp. 369-754. Leipzig, Teubner, 18 M.
- Homer*. Ludwich (Art.) Textkritische Untersuchungen über die mythologischen Scholien zu Homer's Ilias. 4to. 28 pp. Königsberg. 30 Pf.
- Isocrates*. De Bigis. Edited by W. J. Woodhouse. With introduction and notes. Crown 8vo. 56 pp. (Univ. Tut. Series.) Clive. 2s. 6d.
- the same, translated by W. J. Woodhouse. Crown 8vo. 14 pp. Same series and publisher. 1s.
- Julianus Apostata*. Brambs (J. G.) Studien zu den Werken Julians des Apostaten. II. 8vo. 37 pp. Eichstätt.
- Klauser* (H.) Die Erziehung im Alterthum, besonders bei den Hellenen, und in der Neuzeit. 8vo. 23 pp. Czernowitz.
- Liebenam* (W.) Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche. 8vo. xviii, 577 pp. Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot. 14 M.
- Lucian*. Hime (H. W. L.) Lucian, the Syrian Satirist. 8vo. Longmans. 5s.
- Manilius* (M.) Beiträge zur Geschichte des Ovidius und anderer römischer Schriftsteller im Mittelalter. (Aus "Philologus" Suppl. Vol. VII.) 8vo. 48 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1 M.
- Marquart* (J.) Chronologische Untersuchungen. (Aus "Philologus," Suppl. Vol. VII.) 8vo. 86 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 3 M.
- Masi* (A.) Pompeii: its life and art. Translated by F. W. Kelsey. Royal 8vo. 532 pp. Plates. Macmillan. £1 5s.
- Maximus Tyrius*. Dürr (K.) Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Dialekten des Maximus von Tyrus. 8vo. 69 pp. Heidelberg.
- Meyer* (P. M.) Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer in Aegypten. 8vo. x, 231 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 8 M.
- Milchhofer*. Über die Gräberkunst der Hellenen. 8vo. 22 pp. Kiel. 1 M. 40.
- Müller* (K. O.) and F. Wieseler. Antike Denkmäler zur griechischen Götterlehre. 4th Edition by K. Wernicke. Vol. II. Fasc. 2. Poseidon. Demeter. Korä. 8vo. pp. 141-262, 10 plates in oblong folio. Leipzig, Dieterich. 5 M.
- Müller* (Otto) Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des attischen Bürger- und Eherechts. (Aus "Jahrbücher für class. Philologie, Suppl. Vol. 25.") 8vo. pp. 663-863. Leipzig, Teubner. 7 M. 20.
- Musici Romani*. Schmidt (C.) Quaestiones de Musicis scriptoribus Romanis inprimis de Cassiodoro et Isidoro. 8vo. 62 pp. Giessen.
- Neumann* (K. Jo.) Die Grundherrschaft der römischen Republik, die Bauernbefreiung und die Entstehung der servianischen Verfassung. 8vo. 38 pp. Strassburg, Heitz. 1 M.
- Ovidius*. First and second books of the Metamorphoses. Edited for the use of schools by W. T. Peck. (School Classics, by J. Tetlow.) 16 mo. 12. 234 pp. Boston, Ginn. 55 cts.
- Ovid*. Selections from Tristia. Edited with notes and vocabulary by H. F. Morland Simpson. 12 mo. 102 pp. (Cambr. Series for Schools.) Clays. 1s. 6d.
- Petronius*. Enia (Mett.) Il satiricon e il suo autore Petronio Arbitro. 8vo. 101 pp. Palermo.
- Plato*. Theaetetus, translated, with introduction by S. W. Hyde. Crown 8vo. 182 pp. Maclehose. 4s. 6d.
- Plato*. Wilbrandt (R.) Platos Ideenlehre in der Darstellung und in der Kritik des Aristoteles. 8vo. 32 pp. Berlin.
- Plutarch*. Schrader (Herm.) De Plutarchi Chaeronensis Ὀμηρικαὶς μελέταις et de ejusdem quae fertur vita Homeris. 8vo. 40 pp. Gotha, Perthes. 80 Pf.
- Prestel* (F.) Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der griechischen Sprache. 8vo. 67 pp. Münsterstadt.
- Preuner* (Er.) Ein delphisches Weihegeschenk. 8vo. 115 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 M. 20.
- Schmidt* (J.) Über phonetische und graphische

- Erscheinungen im Vulgärgriechischen. 8vo. 36 pp. Leipzig.
- Seneca* (L. Annaeus.) Opera quae supersunt. Vol. I. Fasc. II. De beneficiis libri vii, De clementia libri II. Ed. Car. Hosius. 12mo. xxvi, 267 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M. 40.
- Sophocles*. Blaydes (F. H. M.) Adversaria critica in Sophoclem. 8vo. iv, 290 pp. Halle, Waisenhaus. 6 M.
- Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus*. Recognovit A. Schöne. 8vo. 95 pp. Dresden. 3 M.
- Tacitus*. Müllenhoff (K. J.) Deutsche Altertumskunde. Vol. IV Part 2. Die Germania erläut.
- tert. 8vo. xxiv, pp. 385-751. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 M.
- Theocritus*. Wendel (C.) De nominibus Bucolicis. Pars I: De Theocriti nominibus Bucolicis. 8vo. 34 pp. Halle.
- Thucydides*. Translated into English, with an essay on inscriptions by B. Jowett. 2 vols. 8vo. 890 pp. Frowde. 15s.
- Virgil*. Aeneid. Book V. Edited with notes and vocabulary by A. Sidgwick. 12mo. 116 pp. (Cambr. Series for Schools.) Clays. 1s. 6d.
- Wells* (E. A.) First exercises in Latin prose composition. 12mo. 76 pp. Bell. 1s.